MEDIEVAL EXEGESIS

VOLUME 1

The Four Senses of Scripture

HENRI DE LUBAC, S.J.

Translated by

Mark Sebanc

WILLIAM B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING COMPANY
GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

T&T CLARK
EDINBURGH

Originally published as
Exégèse médiévale, 1: Les quatre sens de l'écriture
© 1959 Éditions Montaigne
English translation © 1998 Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Published jointly 1998 by
Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
255 Jefferson Ave. S.E., Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
and by
T&T Clark Ltd
59 George Street
Edinburgh EH2 2LQ
Scotland

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America

03 02 01 00 99 98 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Lubac, Henri de, 1896-
[Exégèse médiévale. English]
Medieval Exegesis / Henri de Lubac; translated by Mark Sebanc.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
Contents: v. 1. The four senses of scripture.
ISBN 0-8028-4145-7 (pbk.: alk. paper)
1. Bible — Criticism, interpretation, etc. — History — Middle Ages, 600-1500.
I. Title.
BS500.L82513 1998
220.6'09'02 — dc21 97-32802
CIP

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 0 567 08634 8

Contents

Foreword, by Robert Louis Wilken ix

Preface xiii

Introduction 1

1. Theology, Scripture, and the Fourfold Sense 15

2. The Opposing Lists 75

3. Patristic Origins 117

4. The Latin Origen 161

5. The Unity of the Two Testaments 225

Notes 269

Index of Names 459

Foreword

In the little book *The Theology of Henri de Lubac* that Hans Urs von Balthasar, De Lubac's most gifted and most famous student presented to the "master" (as von Balthasar called him) on the occasion of his eightieth birthday, von Balthasar said: "Whoever stands before the forty or so volumes of Henri de Lubac's writings, with their more than 10,000 pages and hundreds of thousands of quotations . . . feels as though he is at the entrance to a primeval forest."

Many readers who pick up this book will have a similar feeling. After reading a few pages one is likely to feel bewildered and lost, even dizzy from the cascade of citations that pour down each page. Almost effortlessly, and with little more identification than the name, De Lubac introduces the reader to dozens, and then hundreds, of Christian thinkers, many whose names will not be found in standard reference works, most of whom lived during the first fifteen hundred years of the Church's history. It is tempting to see *Medieval Exegesis* as a kind of encyclopedia of patristic and medieval exegesis of the Scriptures. Few theological works rival the reach or density of this book. But the reader should be apprised that *Medieval Exegesis* is not a reference work; it is a long, intricate, detailed, and cogent argument in defense of the "spiritual" interpretation of the Bible.

By spiritual exegesis De Lubac means the Christian interpretation of the Old Testament in light of Christ and the New Testament. Although there is much here on the interpretation of the New Testament, the book's focus is on how the Old Testament has been understood by patristic and medieval biblical scholars and theologians. Within this tradition, the unan-

imous tradition of the Church in its first fifteen hundred years, the aim of Christian exegesis of the Old Testament was to discern in it the sense that the Gospel had given to it, to read it in light of faith in Christ and of hope in the Resurrection. Viewed in this light, the Old Testament is no longer simply an historical document from a past epoch, it is the "Word of God that is being received, as it is addressed to us 'here and now.'" In the words of Origen of Alexandria, the first great biblical exegete in Christian history, "If you want to understand, you can only do so through the Gospel."

Medieval Exegesis had its beginning when De Lubac was writing the final chapter to an earlier book, *Histoire et Esprit*, a study of the spiritual understanding of the Scriptures in Origen. While working on that book De Lubac had begun to collect citations from other authors. In a *Mémoire* written late in life, De Lubac says that he kept these notes in a sack that he carried from one dwelling place to another in the 1940s (he lived through the German occupation of France), filling it with more and more note cards as he read other authors. Those that he could not use in the conclusion to *Histoire et Esprit* were the beginning of *Medieval Exegesis*.

In its French edition, *Medieval Exegesis* included four volumes comprising over eighteen hundred pages and surveyed the Christian exegetical tradition from its beginning to the sixteenth century. No other work has such scope, and it remains to this day an inexhaustible resource for the history of Christian biblical interpretation. Yet what gives the work its enduring significance is not simply its breadth and depth. *Medieval Exegesis* shows that biblical exegesis was not a specialized discipline carried on independently of theology; it *was* theology. The Church thought about the mysteries of the faith by expounding the text of the Bible. In the Church Fathers one will seldom find arguments that stand on logical or philosophical grounds alone. Behind most theological discussions was a biblical text or texts, and it was on the basis of these texts that the Church's first teachers gave expression to the central truths of faith and morals.

In the preface to *Medieval Exegesis*, De Lubac argues that the great accomplishment of patristic exegesis was to offer an interpretation of the whole. It was a "complete act," and

> the more it is studied, the more apparent are its broad field of vision, the complexity of its implications, the depth of the bedrock on which it is based, and the originality of its structure. With its varied panoply of nuances, it throws into relief "the prodigious newness of the Christian fact." It sets up an often subtle dialectic of before and after. It

> defines the relationship between historical reality and spiritual reality, between society and the individual, between time and eternity. It contains, as one might say today, a whole theology of history, which is connected with a theology of Scripture. It organizes all of revelation around a concrete center, which is fixed in time and space by the Cross of Jesus Christ. It is itself a complete and completely unified dogmatic and spiritual theology. It found expression not only in literature, but in art, evincing a marvelous power and fecundity. In brief, this ancient form of Christian exegesis is something quite other than just an ancient form of exegesis. It forms "the thread" of Christian literature and Christian art. It constitutes, in one of its essential aspects, ancient Christian thought. (P. xiii)

The first volume of *Medieval Exegesis* appeared in 1959. The other volumes came out in rapid succession, and by 1963 the entire four volumes had been published. De Lubac was born in 1896 in Cambrai, France (his life spans the twentieth century; he died in 1991), and this means that *Medieval Exegesis* is his most mature work. In 1913 he became a Jesuit, and shortly afterward he was conscripted to serve in the French army during the First World War. All his life he would suffer from wounds received in the war. In 1927 he was ordained a priest, and in 1929 he began teaching theology at the Jesuit seminary in Lyon. Most of his life was spent in Lyon, including the years of German occupation of France, and it was there that he did most of the research that formed the basis of his books on Christian exegesis.

As with other Jesuits of his generation, De Lubac's primary formation was in scholastic philosophy and theology. His most famous work, *Surnaturel*, is a study of a problem within Thomistic theology. It was only in his forties that he turned to early Christian exegesis. With Jean Daniélou and others, he was responsible for inaugurating the new series of patristic texts *Sources Chrétiennes*, which made available, often for the first time, translations of early Christian biblical commentaries, homilies, and spiritual works. Up to that time most of the translations were of theological or polemical works. De Lubac wrote the introduction to the French translation of Origen's homilies on Genesis, which was published as volume 7 of *Sources Chrétiennes* in 1944.

It was his reading of the Church Fathers that gave him the idea that is central to *Medieval Exegesis*, which is that "spiritual exegesis" or allegory is not a borrowing of literary techniques from the Greeks but rather a distinctly Christian approach to the Old Testament as found in the New

Testament, particularly in the letters of St. Paul. In passages such as 1 Corinthians 10 and Galatians 4, St. Paul taught the Church that the key to the interpretation of the Old Testament is Christ. In these passages, says Origen, Paul "gives us some examples of interpretation that we might observe similar things in other passages." In the many examples in *Medieval Exegesis*, De Lubac displays traditional spiritual exegesis not as an alien doctrine imposed on the Scriptures from without but as interpretation in light of the "prodigious new fact of Christ." "The conversion of the Old Testament to the New or of the letter of Scripture to its spirit can only be explained and justified, in its radicalness, by the all-powerful and unprecedented intervention of him who is himself at once the Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last. . . . Therefore Jesus Christ brings about the unity of Scripture, because he is the endpoint and fullness of Scripture. Everything in it is related to him. In the end he is its sole object. Consequently, he is, so to speak, its whole exegesis" (pp. 235-37).

De Lubac's book is a work of retrieval and renewal, of *ressourcement*, of drawing anew from the living spring of Christian learning, wisdom, and experience. Indeed, it was the circle of French scholars and theologians with whom De Lubac was associated in the 1940s — Jean Daniélou, Yves Congar, M. D. Chenu, and others — who were responsible for the return to the sources that has had such a profound impact on late twentieth-century Christian thought. De Lubac has sharp words for those who think that the exegesis of the Church Fathers and medievals is moribund or antiquated or naive or childish. And he is no less cutting in his comments about those who think that the exegetical writings of the past are to be studied chiefly for historical purposes. As the splendor of medieval Christian exegesis unfolds in this book, it becomes apparent that DeLubac is not writing history. His is a treatise on how the Bible is to be interpreted today. Or, to put the matter more finely, he believed that we will go forward not by forgetting or abandoning the past but by integrating the biblical writings of patristic and medieval times into our own best intuitions.

It is a great pleasure to be have the first volume of this magisterial work in English. De Lubac writes an idiomatic French, and he is ably served by his translator, Mark Sebanc, who renders not only his French but also his many Latin citations into felicitous English. *Medieval Exegesis* is a modern theological classic, and it is fitting that it should be part of the outstanding *Ressourcement* series originated by William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Robert Louis Wilken

Preface

The present work is not an allegorical or spiritual study of Scripture. Instead, it is a work that endeavors to be an historical and literal study of the ancient commentators on Scripture. And inasmuch as these commentators were quite often not exegetes in the modern, specialized sense of the word, the examination of their thought that I have undertaken will be less a contribution to the history of exegesis properly speaking than to the history of theology, or rather to the study of Christian thought and spirituality in general.

In an earlier book of mine, entitled *Histoire et Esprit*, I embarked upon this subject, not perhaps at its very fountainhead, but as it is manifest, at least, in one of the first authors who evinces its rich substance. Now I embark on this subject again, not perhaps quite at its end point, but at a later period, at any rate. My focal point is no longer, as it was with Origen, the great patristic period. Instead my focus has shifted to the Latin Middle Ages. Whereas I was earlier concerned with a privileged moment in time that was characterized by a blossoming forth of genius, my considerations now lie more particularly with the typical representatives of a tradition that has already been established. For this new study, my intention right at the outset was to hold fast to the boundary limits of a theme that had been broached in its most external and unprofitable aspect. Indeed, the nomenclature of the four biblical senses does not bring us into the presence of a great, overflowing fountainhead of thought, but of a dryasdust collection of writings that are more or less late-blooming and often replete with artificial distinctions. What is more, these writings are sometimes a showcase for all sorts of capricious oddness. Nonetheless, the more I

delved into this project, the more I was compelled to recognize the following truth: even in the least of the texts that presented themselves for my analysis, a whole mental universe was contained. To be satisfied with studying them superficially and in terms solely of their most immediate purport was not merely to give up in the effort of understanding their authors. It was, in fact, to betray them. Through the angle of approach offered by these four senses, I was thus introduced forcefully, as it were, into the heart of a current of thought which, throughout the multiple phases of its history, showed itself to be singularly unified.

Now, at the same time, there was another fact that served to astonish me. It concerned this current of thought. A number of historians, even the most erudite ones, seemed hardly to notice it, even when they happened to express themselves with all clarity. While, for example, the Christian tradition reiterates, in many ways, from century to century, that "the spiritual sense of the Old Testament is the New Testament," how many expositions of ancient forms of exegesis, how many judgments bearing on these forms do not even allude to the significance of the relationship between the two Testaments on this question! While this tradition everywhere professes a desire to follow the teaching and example of Saint Paul, there is a preoccupation only with the links that it has with Philo — when, that is, it is not linked with the pagan Cornutus and those of his ilk. And the extent to which this tradition seeks the spirit in the letter is thought to result merely from a Platonic prejudice that makes the body the prison-house of the soul. The processes that it uses or the abuses that injure it are described at length and severely judged. But its original principles remain veiled. Once more, it happens that the forest cannot be seen for the trees. Through a facile, but deceptive, reduction, the whole tradition is explained according to its analogies, real or supposed, with what it is not. Thus, in the case of allegory, a veritable equivocation is used to denounce "the killer fungus of exegesis," or there is a temptation to see, in the work of Saint Bernard, an eminent case of "monastic routine." There are certain authors who let themselves be deceived by a trite phenomenon of transferal, and so attribute to the old authors obscurities or confusions that only exist in their own minds.[1] There are others who are more indulgent, inasmuch as they make an effort at historical understanding. But even so, they persist in portraying this tradition as a remote series of preparations or provisional substitutions for the scientific knowledge of our present time. They imagine that if, in olden times, "the mysteries" were exalted, it was because, in a way, this was the only means then known of rationalizing facts that seemed absurd or scandalous. It is believed that an

understanding of the phenomenon is fully plumbed when it is said that "allegorical exegesis did yeoman service in maintaining the Bible in a very pure and very high sphere of ideas and sentiments, until men's minds became mature enough to embark on a knowledge of the past and a direct explication of texts." This is how staunch Marxists do justice to someone like Saint Thomas Aquinas. This is how, in the last century, socialism gladly praised primitive Christianity for having in some way prefigured it. It is even stranger that this exclusive point of view leads believers rather curiously to celebrate the progress finally realized at the dawn of modern times. "Since this is the case," they say, Scripture "ceases to be a mirror of eternal truth." Instead it becomes "merely a collection of works whose authors sought to attain particular truths." I well understand that, when they speak in this way, they are only thinking of the most positive and certain scientific knowledge. But were the Ancients wrong in supposing that the Bible bears the stamp of eternal truth?

Thus we find errors of fact and equivocations of language, intertwined as they are with value judgments. We also find huge omissions that coincide with the most acute observations and the most valuable historical analyses. All of these are contributing factors in perpetuating the misreading to which ancient exegesis is subject. Could it be that our very own time, in certain subjects, at least, is not yet "mature enough at all for an intelligent knowledge of the past and the direct explication of texts"? We should not lay the blame for this state of affairs solely on a certain scientific narrowness or some modern prejudice any more than on a lack of maturity. To a much greater extent than they think, some historians in this area of inquiry rely on an old anti-Catholic controversy of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a controversy that was itself subsequently reinforced by the insipid rationalism of the "enlightenment" — that selfsame "enlightenment" which made all of the supernatural "a province of the imagination," as André Malraux says.[2] It was not without its vindications, as we shall see in due course. But its critical approach bore too long a reach. It went so far as to condemn the "allegorical" interpretation of Scripture, as it was systematized in the doctrine of the four senses, as being a Greek invention, on the same plane as the "Greek" dogma of the councils and the "Greek" mysticism of the monks. For such a cast of mind these were three interconnected modes that made for the corruption of the Gospel, three parallel and interdependent manifestations of the same spirit: the very spirit of Catholicism. Indeed, there is a further implication to this line of thought. What we see is that for those who engaged in this controversy a part of the historical error was subtly interwoven with a

denial of principle. They did not concede that the divinely revealed contribution could have been in some way interiorized in man in such a way as to bear its fruit within him.[3] In particular, they rejected as an impure concoction that "understanding of faith"[4] which "considers the truth of faith not as a brute given fact, but as an assimilating force that transforms the very intelligence."[5] This passionate denial encompassed scholasticism as well, which was judged to be no less arbitrary, with its "subtleties," its "logomachy," and its "illusory verbalism." No less scandalous, in their eyes, was scholasticism's claim to interpret with the resources of reason what they thought should have been simply received.

Vigorously contradicted though they were at first by apologists for the tradition of the Church, in the long run these judgments ended up intimidating and eventually even seducing a number of minds within the bosom of Catholicism itself. Thus, a new kind of tradition was established among men of learning. This threw a screen over reality. Since that time, what had been, to put it simply, "one of the most remarkable phenomena" of Christian thought to have appeared in many centuries could no longer "be understood in all its amplitude."[6] Without a doubt, there was an absolute duty to maintain the dogmatic teaching authorized by the councils. But beginning at the end of the seventeenth century, roughly speaking, the two mysticisms, that of exegesis and that of spirituality, which in other respects had long constituted only one mysticism, became an object of censure and disgrace. This disgrace was often shared by scholasticism.[7] Since that time, scholasticism has waxed in strength and has buttressed its standing. Similarly, our century has seen a partial renewal, at least, of interest in mysticism. The case of ancient exegesis is not at all comparable to the situations of scholasticism and mysticism. As we shall see, it is a much more mixed and uncertain affair. Such as it is, this brand of exegesis has managed to stay alive. A more radical sorting out of the elements that go to make it up needs to be done. Nevertheless, from the point of view of history and even of doctrine, a reaction is coming to the fore against a great many of the judgments that are currently still pronounced on it. Indeed, this reaction is well under way, and if it should find itself compromised, it would be, more than anything else, because of a certain excess of unenlightened zeal. But on the whole, the fact that the thought espoused by "patristic and medieval commentators" has benefited for some time from a "renewal of interest" seems to me to be a phenomenon that is more encouraging than "alarming."[8] Thank God that the reflections proffered ten years ago by Dom Jean Leclercq are coming true:

> The renewed emphasis on the givens of the biblical and patristic periods begs the following question: to what extent were these witnesses to the faith, namely, all the Doctors and Christian thinkers of the first centuries of the Church, capable unanimously of straying into the pathways of error? It is quite noteworthy that the great masters of scholasticism preserved many of the givens that they had received from them. Even among the Protestants, a return to orthodoxy, in reaction to the corrosive negations of the radical rationalists, has led to a re-examination of the doctrine of the Fathers and a reconsideration of it in a vivid, new light. The future will bring syntheses that have been extricated from the tangle of polemical ends and shorn of apologetical preoccupations or prejudices favorable to such and such a school or to certain historical eras rather than to tradition as a whole. Doubtless it will be the object of these syntheses to show that progress . . . has consisted not so much in eliminating as in integrating, within the framework of solid logical constructions, the fruitful intuitions of both the Fathers and the authors who flourished in the first phase of the Middle Ages.[9]

If our first concern is with history, the primary condition of a more exact understanding is for us to banish the cliché that speaks of the "naivety of the Middle Ages." We must lay aside all our scornful or derisive attitudes about the men of this era. What is more, we must abandon a certain tone, all too frequent yet, of smirking condescension. This was the tone, for example, that the brothers Tharaud adopted, when they spoke, at the outset, of their "dearly beloved Péguy." Finally, there ought to be a refusal to see even the greatest of these men as nothing more than "overgrown children." No longer is there any excuse for anyone who thinks that he has to affect an air of surprise, as if he were faced with an "anachronism" or an "enigma," each time that he discovers in one or another of these authors "some extremely judicious insight," some superiority of mind or culture. Nor is there any excuse for anyone who thinks that he is under an obligation never to admire any one of their works, except when he honors it by judging it worthy to stand alongside our modern works.[10] Let us allow ourselves to be persuaded that their writings, even though they are quite different from ours, can furnish us with more than just childish babblings. It is well worth the effort to endeavor to understand the serious lines of their thought, even if we are under no obligation to adopt and follow them.[11] If, indeed, we end up perceiving that not everything in this period is so very "barbaric" or "strange," we

must still be willing to gather together more than just the links of the "golden chain" that "connects the end of pagan antiquity to the Renaissance"[12]; for "if it is enthralling to note across the ages how the use of forms that are quite often dead is perpetuated," how could it not be "far more interesting and more nourishing" to observe the continuity of a living tradition and to follow "the destined path of the word of life" from one end of these same ages to the other![13] Thus we ought to be ready to recognize that medieval exegesis may well be something more than "a slight diversion," "a senseless game," "a mania," "an exercise in bad taste," a repudiation of "good sense," "a terrible folly." We should be prepared to acknowledge that it may well contain something more than mere "subtleties" and "bizarre speculations." To penetrate through to the soul of medieval exegesis, there are doubtless better things for a person to do than to proclaim with endless glibness, while foraging here and there amid the examples that press thick and fast, that its allegories are "fantastic" or that its symbolism "is shocking to common sense" and "can no longer give us any pleasure."

A second condition for a more exact understanding on our part ought to consist of our forswearing, out of concern for method, not only a general feeling of superiority, but also a point of view that is overly finalistic. Such a point of view would tend to explain all the syntheses of the past as a function of our present syntheses, as if the great authors of the twelfth century, for example, were of no major interest, except insofar as they help us to understand historically the doctrinal progress of the following century, by permitting us to reconstruct the framework of problems that served as a springboard for this progress. When one wants to give an account of the present, it is entirely legitimate, by a "regressive process,"[14] to delve into the past in order to do research on the outlines and preparations for the present and to see how the present is anticipated in a more remote time. What is much less legitimate, if one wishes to know the past, is to be primarily interested in it only in order to detect elements in it that might bear some relationship to the present. In this way, a person is liable to reject everything that does not make an immediately useful contribution in terms of a response to the questions of the day. At any rate, if the past is not appreciated in and for itself, what is essential will have eluded us. This failure to appreciate the past on its own terms is a form of contempt that carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction. In other words, we need to mistrust this "retrospective illusion," which was so well analyzed by Bergson and which subverts not only a host of individual memories, but also a multitude of works that are dedicated to the history of

ideas. Something that existed long ago was, in its time, "a complete act," and it must be understood as such, in its totality.

Now this "complete act" that is ancient Christian exegesis is a very great thing. The more it is studied, the more apparent are its broad field of vision, the complexity of its implications, the depth of the bedrock on which it is based, and the originality of its structure. With its varied panoply of nuances, it throws into relief "the prodigious newness of the Christian fact."[15] It sets up an often subtle dialectic of before and after. It defines the relationship between historical reality and spiritual reality, between society and the individual, between time and eternity. It contains, as one might say today, a whole theology of history, which is connected with a theology of Scripture. It organizes all of revelation around a concrete center, which is fixed in time and space by the Cross of Jesus Christ. It is itself a complete and completely unified dogmatic and spiritual theology. It found expression not only in literature, but in art, evincing a marvelous power and fecundity. In brief, this ancient form of Christian exegesis is something quite other than just an ancient form of exegesis. It forms "the thread"[16] of Christian literature and Christian art. It constitutes, in one of its essential aspects, ancient Christian thought. It is the principal form that the Christian synthesis had for a long time been shaped by. At the very least, it is the instrument that permitted this synthesis to be constructed, and today it is one of the devices by which a person can approach it most easily.

Was this ancient form of exegesis merely a rickety scaffold or a wholly provisional structure? It would be difficult to keep it propped up without its having been more than that. It is hard to imagine two successive types of Christian thought that could be so totally and heterogeneously different from one another, even though, in the transition from one to the other, perfect continuity in the affirmations of the faith was assuredly to be found. It is, however, quite certain — and this has been the case for some time — that the techniques of the science of biblical studies, not to mention those of theology, can no longer accommodate themselves to this ancient form. This is why, too, as always happens, we have difficulty understanding what this form was. At first glance, it seems no more than an ossified thing, and more than anything else we judge it on the basis of what it lacks. Now there should be no equivocation on the following point either: to be cool toward the scientific knowledge and the mental habits of our own time would not be a help in retrieving the mental habits of times gone by. To take refuge in an exegesis improperly dubbed "mystical" and made up "of human expedients and arrangements"[17] would simply be

ridiculous. "Quite often a custom of the Church is considered to have been changed. What has happened is that the Holy Spirit has changed its outward trappings in keeping with the times."[18] In revolt as they are to these movements of the Spirit quite as much as they are blind to the irreversible character of the natural course of things, the archaizers belong to neither the present nor the past. They lose the one without finding the other. Thus the participants in a recent congress of biblical sciences should be applauded, inasmuch as they felt "the pressing need to undertake research that is always being propelled further along in its course by the most rigorous of modern techniques."[19] And, in their right and proper place, these techniques may, without undue pride, be construed as an instance of enormous progress.[20] The key phrase here is "in their right and proper place." Without this proviso, there can be no real progress.[21] And the Ancients can still help us to situate this right and proper place within the context of a whole picture that gives it its true measure and significance. The Ancients do not have an explanation for everything, as many have the tendency to suppose. This is because they lived in a precritical age. Nevertheless, "beyond the methods that have become strange to us," we often find "a profoundly thought out theology" in their work.[22] Their exegesis was animated by an extraordinarily powerful sense of synthesis. This is why it retains a "permanent value," and, as Louis Bouyer has written, the principle of it "does not lie at the heart merely of all Christian exegesis, but at the heart of the Christian faith itself."[23]

In undertaking to make a study of this exegesis, I have been ever conscious of the twofold reflection that Joseph Lortz offers when he presents the reader with his history of the Church:

> Only a scientific knowledge that is inspired by enthusiasm penetrates right into the very heart of things. However, this scientific knowledge needs to remain sincere, and the enthusiasm needs to be tempered.[24]

Both these ideas strike me as having even greater urgency, inasmuch as we are dealing with conceptions that are widely misconstrued, but also, in part at least, legitimately obsolete. This is certainly not to say that, in making them my own, I have been able to draw satisfactory inspiration from them in every respect. It may be that certain folk will be prompted to think that I have given enthusiasm too ample a part to play. I make bold nevertheless to hope that they will not hold it as a grievance against me that I am attached to so many ancient witnesses to our Catholic tradition, that I have loved them, and that I have tried to understand them and

make them understood. I have not introduced, it must be reiterated, any sort of archaism, any sort of desire to arrest time or stem its flow — although the very effort of reconstructing the past can sometimes give the appearance of being just such an enterprise. Nothing is more vain and fruitless than such attempts to return to one of these ancient stages of growth that history makes it possible for us to know, to settle down in it, to ensconce ourselves in it as in a dream. Even if attempts like this did not involve an attitude that is incompatible with faith, they would stand condemned under a heading that is even more basic. They have something of the childish and faint-hearted about them. If, then, I am loath to treat any of the twenty centuries of Christianity as a "prehistoric universe," I am no more inclined to envision any of them as a "paradise lost."[25] I am full of admiration for the prodigious efforts at exegesis that are unfolding in the Church today, and I am most hopeful that these efforts will continue unabated. But, in this case, I was compelled to live with the Ancients, to enter into their categories, and to force myself to speak their language.

Finally, I have always been of the naive belief — although it must be said that all the teachings of the Church confirm me in this notion — that in the witness they give to their faith, no less than in the witness they expect from us in return, all the Christian generations enjoy a oneness and solidarity. It is some portion of this witness, under one of the forms with which it is invested, that I seek to grasp and comprehend. If it is indeed true that "a man's warm and living memory of what he once was and what he can no longer be in the present may well be necessary for him to realize his own wholeness,"[26] this truth, *mutatis mutandis*, is no less applicable to the Christian than to the natural man. That is why, even though all tasks or undertakings may not be compatible, admiring one of them does not necessarily work to the detriment of another. With all the more reason would it be a miscalculation, in view of the ponderous lack of comprehension shown by unbelieving historians, to depreciate any of the successive aspects of a tradition that is always one. It ought to be a joy for the historian to unearth some inkling of humanity from a far-distant past. It ought to be a still greater joy if he succeeds in restoring in its freshness some ancient form of the life of the mind, a form whose beauty has been lost, even though he has no hope of kindling it to life again other than as an aspect of memory. How much greater would the joy of the Christian be if he succeeded in conveying a part of this heritage to the present generation, commending it to its understanding, to its esteem, and to its admiration, without hiding from it the weaknesses and decrepit elements that mark it.

The reader will not find a connected, sequential history in this work. Diverse themes are broached, and it is to be hoped that their convergence will become apparent. But, except when the purpose at hand demands it, there has been no attempt to reconstruct complete series of facts or texts in their age-old development nor always to determine where they ended up. This work, therefore, will have more affinities, on the whole, to a sociology of thought than to its history — if this word, "sociology," is not itself improper, evoking the idea of a wholly objective science. In point of fact, as the author, I am far from taking a step back and engaging in objective science, thus placing myself in opposition to my object in some way. Rather, I am deliberately preserving those links with the object that render me bound up with it. In this sense, I am not engaged in a work of "objective" science. But such a declaration on my part is neither an admission nor a search for an excuse. To a certain extent, the consciousness of a community of faith that exists between myself and those whose thought I am studying is quite well able to keep me from looking at my object from the outside. There is no reason why this shared faith should not allow me to reach the very heart of my object and thus come to a true understanding of it. All of this, though, is in no way a prejudgment of the manner in which the thing will actually be accomplished — which, to be sure, is less than objective perhaps. It may, however, happen, especially in the ranks of Catholic historians, that many will reproach me, not for having lapsed into paradox, but rather for having been insistent on factual evidence in many a passage that I have written. Why, they will say, should so much time and energy be spent in belaboring obvious points? Let them pardon me for supposing that, while a point may be obvious to some people, the same point may remain clouded and opaque to others. If some specialist or other has already been effective in bringing his knowledge to bear on a given point of light, it remains worthwhile even so to attempt to bring together these scattered points of light, in the hope that a certain number of minds may be illumined.

I have read as many texts as I could, but I was not able to delve into innumerable unpublished texts. As for the published ones, I was not, by any means, able to touch on them all. In order to show them to better effect, I have endeavored never to lose sight of the vast and simple doctrinal context within which they are borne. I am entirely indebted to the researchers who unearthed them and commented on them. I admire their patience and their incisive clarity more than words can say. Among them, there are some whose judgments I was forced to criticize in certain respects. These, however, are not always those to whom I owe the least. In

the indispensable division of tasks, it is inevitable that not everyone is equally attentive to all aspects of reality. Often it struck me that, if I believed that I sometimes arrived at a better appreciation of the thrust of certain old texts, it was because I was like the dwarf perched on the shoulders of a giant. Or, to use another image that occurs everywhere in this history, the building I have erected takes the solidity and stability that it enjoys from the broad, deep foundations dug by a legion of workers who did the hardest work and whose knowledge astounds me.

Among those to whom I am bound by a more particular debt of gratitude for the many kinds of help they gave me, I am happy to acknowledge Fathers André Ravier and Blaise Arminjon. Their energetic and indefatigable kindness protected me from any kind of discouragement. I also wish to acknowledge Dom Jean Leclercq, O.S.B., of the Abbeys of Clervaux and Saint Jerome. His friendly counsel and erudite opinions never failed me. In addition, I am thankful to Dom Edmond Boissard, O.S.B., of Solesmes, Dom Paul Meyvaert, O.S.B., of Quarr Abbey, and Dom Marie-André Louf, O.C.S.O., of Mont-des-Cats, who gave me valuable information; Father Jean Châtillon, who was willing to read a part of the work in manuscript and allowed me to profit from his observations; Father Michel Aunet, whose generous hospitality permitted me to finish my task; Fathers Robert Brunet and François Graffin, the librarians at Chantilly, and Bernard de Vregille, librarian at Fourvière, all of whom showed themselves to be so fraternally obliging; Miss Marie-Thérèse d'Alverny, keeper of manuscripts at the Bibliothèque nationale; and, finally, Fathers Claude Mondésert, Henri Bouillard, Jacques Guillet, Joseph Paramelle, Hasso Jaeger, and Charles Kannengiesser, whose diligent friendship sustained me so very often and in so many different ways.

Introduction

The distich with which our own Latin Middle Ages slowly established its doctrine relative to the senses of Sacred Scripture is well known. Its form was meant to act as an aid to memory and was at once popular and quasi-scholastic:

> The letter teaches events, allegory what you should believe,
> Morality teaches what you should do, anagogy what mark you should be aiming for.[1]

Nicholas of Lyra cites it, around the year 1330, in his *Postilla* on the Letter to the Galatians,[2] not to mention a passage of his celebrated Prologue to the *Glossa ordinaria* — a passage on which all of the present study will merely be a commentary.[3] It is from his work that the distich is most often cited. What is more, it is readily attributed to him.[4] He is not, however, the author. These are "ancient verses," says the Jesuit author Goldhazen.[5] Samuel Berger appears to attribute them to the Dominican John Balbi, who is dubbed John of Genoa, and who did indeed cite them as early as the year 1286 in his *Summa quae vocatur Catholicon*, for the word "allegoria."[6] Their real author is another Dominican, who died a little before that, in 1282. His name was Augustine of Dacia. This Augustine, who was of Scandinavian origin, published the *Rotulus pugillaris*, a work of fifteen chapters, around 1260. It was a kind of theological compendium for the use of the "simple."[7] At the end of each chapter there is a summary of its contents in a few verses. Our celebrated distich constitutes the summary of the first chapter, entitled "De introductoriis scientiae theologicae." This

chapter expounds the teaching of Saint Thomas as contained in the first Question of the Summa.[8] In it, the end of the second verse is presented as follows: ". . . anagogy is what you hope for."[9] Nicholas of Lyra's variant of this does not change the meaning.[10]

"These little verses can hardly be considered poetic. Rather, they are trite and commonplace." This is how Nicholas Serarius, another Jesuit, described these lines. Serarius was out to avenge the doctrine that these verses condense in the battle against the sarcasms of Luther.[11] "Verses that scarcely qualify as Latin and that everyone knows by heart."[12] Similar verses — didactic poetry was a very common genre in the Middle Ages — laid out the same teaching in a somewhat less condensed form. Such was the following quatrain, neither as ancient nor as well known (although somewhat more refined), which was cited by Philippe Gamache, a doctor at the Sorbonne under Louis XIII, in his theological Summa:

> What words themselves disclose is said to be historical,
> And allegorical is said to be the part that is played amid the long-lost, ancient shadows,
> Moral is the part through which a rule of life is maintained,
> While the anagogical part soars higher, proffering to you what you should lay before you as an object of your hope.[13]

More ancient are the strophes of the *Fons philosophiae*, in which Godfrey of Saint Victor expounds on the "four ways of understanding Sacred Scripture":

> This stream has four different features:
> In some parts it can be crossed, in other parts it is deep.
> Here it is more pleasing to the taste, sweet and delightful,
> Nor does it flow back to the heights from which it has sprung.
> When it is more clearly history, it is easy to cross,
> Whereas it is hard to swim the deep waters of allegory,
> It is easy to drink the savory waters of morality,
> While anagogy is regurgitated and does not stay down.[14]

We know that this *Fons philosophiae* presents, in symbolic form, the complete cycle of formation that Godfrey received at Saint Victor around the middle of the twelfth century. The above two strophes occur in the second part of the poem, which is devoted to theological studies. There Scripture is compared to a river, on the banks of which is built the Church,

the City of God. This was an ancient image, inspired by Scripture itself, and already to be found in work of Saint Jerome.[15] Before elaborating, with a certain attention to detail, on the content of the Old Testament, Godfrey speaks again about this river that has four currents:

> Although, as we have said, the river has four parts,
> History is more a shaper of the rituals of the Old Testament,
> And on this account is more oriented to the other shore;
> The three-part way is nearer to us.[16]

In other words, as the marginal note explains, the first sense, or history, is related to the Old Testament. Therefore, as it relates to us, it is now far removed. The three other senses concern the New Testament. This is a precise detail of great importance, which I shall have occasion to recall throughout my study.

Giles of Paris belongs to the generation which follows that of Godfrey. He wrote verses on the way that Sacred Scripture should be read. In all probability, these verses date back to the final years of the twelfth century. He, though, deduces only three senses:

> This well is deep, it plumbs the abyss . . . ,
> This simple outward shell contains a great variety of food:
> The letter is to be thought of as the outward shell, the senses as three varieties of food.
> Investigate the historical, typical, and moral senses . . .
> When you read the historical text, a kind of milky sweetness is imbibed, or rather a draught of simple water . . . ,
> In the typical sense the keen tang of wine can be felt . . .
> Whoever drinks this wine of Scripture hunts for Jesus and finds him, reaching him on the wooded heights.
> When your reading gives you the moral sense,
> Then it is as if your mouth were sucking on a honeycomb. . . .[17]

There is another poem that was written much later by Sixtus of Siena and inserted in his *Bibliotheca sancta.* The genre is somewhat different. Instead of characterizing the four kinds of senses directly, he names the respective Fathers of the Church who have most excelled in each of them:

> Under the guidance of Jerome you will learn history derived from Greek and Latin sources.

Origen and Ambrose will lay open allegories and anagogy.
Chrysostom and Gregory will set forth the senses that are apt to form morals.
Aurelius sheds light on doubtful areas and places that are submerged in deep darkness.
But the beginner should not reject the short, appropriate exposition that comes from Lyra.[18]

Sixtus of Siena drew his inspiration from a similar poem, in which the jurist Andrew Alciatus had characterized the most celebrated interpreters of civil law. We can disregard the last two verses, a homage to Nicholas of Lyra, whose popularity was enormous. The kind of adaptation seen in this poem had long been traditional. In his *Ecclesiastes*, Erasmus remarked that it resembles that other kind of adaptation, which had prompted the twelve articles of the Creed to be apportioned among the twelve apostles.[19] Under a simpler form, which mentioned only the four great doctors of the Latin Church, it could already be dated back several centuries.

This list of four doctors had been given by the Venerable Bede (†735). It is from him, at least, that we today have the first attestation of it.[20] It is not improbable that the classic list of four Roman rhetoricians, as it had been hypothetically formulated, had an influence on its formation. Did Saint Jerome not remark that "every type of career has its leading lights," going on to cite four generals, four philosophers, four poets, and four orators?[21] In any case, when we turn to the writings of Bede, the list is clearly calqued on the list of four evangelists, such as given by Saint Gregory the Great.[22] It serves as an introduction, moreover, to a whole development based on the four evangelists, symbolized by the Four Living Creatures of the Book of Revelation.[23] We meet up with it in the ninth century in Joannes Monachus,[24] Smaragdus of Saint Michael's,[25] and Paulus Alvarus of Cordova,[26] not to mention Agobard and the correspondence of Rabanus Maurus with King Lothair.[27] We also encounter it in the eleventh century in the life of John of Gorze by John of Saint-Arnoul,[28] in Berengar of Tours,[29] Gotschalk of Limbourg,[30] and Sigebert of Gembloux.[31] In 1086, in his *Ars lectoria*, Aimeric of Angoulême ranges the works of our four great doctors, together with the Book of Maccabees and the "blessing of spouses," in with his second category of books, that of "hagiographers" or silver books. He places these silver books immediately after "genuine" or golden books, which comprise the whole of the Bible and the canon of the Mass.[32] Until the twelfth century, however, the list of doctors is most often still a fluctuating one. In the wake of Cassiodorus,[33] who, to be sure,

did not yet know Saint Gregory, the list is headed more than once by Cyprian and Hilary. This is true of the texts of two councils of the ninth century.[34] It can also be expanded or modified.[35] Sometimes, for example, mixed in with the names of the Latins are the names of certain Greeks — especially John Chrysostom,[36] Athanasius,[37] and even Origen.[38] Sometimes we find Saint Leo being added to the list.[39] Sometimes, on the other hand, the prestigious names of Jerome and Augustine,[40] or Augustine and Gregory,[41] are the only ones to emerge from an anonymous group. Of course, Saint Gregory only found his place on the list after some time. In Rome, beginning in the first half of the eighth century, he can be seen associated with Saint Jerome and Saint Augustine.[42] Isidore cites him in the following terms, eighth on a list in which Cassian is the seventh: "and in our own times, particularly, the eloquent Gregory."[43] And in the second half of the century, Ambrose Autpert uses him to round out the august foursome in a formula which may suggest that this was not too common yet: if someone, he says, putting the finishing touches on his commentary on the Book of Revelation, seeks to return to our faith, "let him by all means hold fast to Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, and our own Gregory."[44] Indeed, from the tenth century right to the very heart of the eleventh century, Gregory's name is not to be found listed. In the tenth century, for example, this absence of Gregory's name applies to Notker,[45] even though the writings of the holy pope were his delight. The same is true, in the eleventh century, of the writings of Bruno de Segni[46] or Adelmann of Liège.[47] Gregory's name does not appear there. Nor does it make appearance in the works of several other authors of the twelfth century.[48] On the other hand, quite naturally, the Spanish love to associate Saint Isidore of Seville[49] with this great pope, Saint Isidore being that other latter-day glory of the Catholic Church, "the most learned doctor who ever was."[50] Elsewhere, though, the name of Bede has more resonance for the moderns. Cistercian authors would sometimes complete their list by adding Saint Bernard.[51] The subject under discussion can also have an effect; this explains, in more than one case, why a certain name is added or another omitted.

Even in the twelfth century, the list does not seem to come to a definite halt. The *Liber Pancrisis*, which begins by naming the four great ones, adds Isidore and Bede to their number, inasmuch as the two of them have now become "ancients." After that, it refers to the "modern masters."[52] Ambrose, who is always thoughtfully praised, but who remains a somewhat shadowy figure, continues to be sold short at times. After Lanfranc,[53] this is found to be the case in the writings of Queen Matilda,[54] and then also

in those of Goscelin,[55] Geoffrey Babion,[56] and Huguccio.[57] Werner of Saint Blaise even puts Hilary in his place.[58] As for Gerhoh of Reichersberg, he puts Hilary in Jerome's place, doubtless on account of his christological teachings;[59] likewise Gilbert Foliot, who shows "the holy doctors and great confessors, Ambrose, Hilary, Augustine, and the like" as following after the martyrs.[60] The classical list, however, appears most frequently. The four great Latin doctors are more and more often construed as being connected with the four evangelists. The quaternary symbols of the Bible and of cosmology are applied to both doctors and evangelists: four rivers, four winds, four shores, four corners of the world. . . .[61] The *Glossa ordinaria* confirms this symbolism.[62] Around the year 1140, Hugh Metel, who excels at reproducing commonplaces, wrote:

> Read, reread, and consider, with a recollected memory, the writings of the four evangelists, that is to say, Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, Gregory. Mount this four-horse chariot, which bears you on high and which will show you the highest pinnacles of knowledge.[63]

Liturgical texts even went so far as to attribute to each of the doctors one of the animals that traditionally designate the four evangelists. Witness this hymn from the Abbey of Marmoutiers:

> Gregory, a fluent man,
> Sweet-talking, pure-living,
> Had the face of a *man*.
> Ambrose, a mighty *lion*,
> Like Elijah, never hushed up
> Vice for fear of death.
>
> Jerome, an *ox* walking
> Fearlessly, held fast
> To the ways of Scripture.
> Above them all, Augustine,
> A divine man who sought the heights,
> Was found worthy to bear the face of an *eagle*.[64]

In Honorius,[65] in Gerland of Besançon,[66] in Isaac of Stella,[67] and in Innocent III,[68] our four doctors are brought together for joint praise, or praise, at least, that is not individually specified. Even so, there had always been a tendency to distinguish each one of them by a particular attribute,

by a competence, by a virtue, or by an appropriate characteristic. Jerome, for example, was exemplary for his strictness, Augustine for his modesty, Ambrose for his gentleness, and Gregory for his patience.[69] Also, we have the *Liber in partibus Donati* by Smaragdus, which explains that "Augustine discusses things clearly, Jerome explicates them elegantly, Ambrose speaks of them learnedly, and Gregory handles them morally."[70] Around 1120, the author of the *Aurea gemma* notes that Gregory sweeps him away "with his charm and sweetness," while Augustine does the same "with his expertly subtle argumentation," Jerome "with the weight of his opinions," and Ambrose "with his speculative disputation."[71] An anonymous sketch, which is surely a fair bit older than the fifteenth-century manuscript that contains it, adds Origen and Hilary to the classical list. This is the way it characterizes the six doctors that it enumerates:

> The discussions of Origen are esteemed and recognized by the abundant morality and authority of his opinions; those of Augustine by their subtle spirit of investigation; those of Jerome by their historical profundity . . . those of Ambrose by the flawless eloquence and urbanity of his words; those of Hilary by a certain literary way he has of speaking; those of Gregory by a a kind of verbal eloquence and the generous expansiveness at the close of his periods.[72]

What we have here is a literary form inherited from classical antiquity. Our medievals found a model of it in Macrobius, who defined the four "ways of speaking" (abundant, brief, dry, and bold),[73] attaching these four qualities respectively to the names of Cicero, Sallust, Fronto, and Pliny the Younger. [74] Similarly, in one of his Epistles, Sidonius Apollinaris had cited as many as thirteen names of great men: first four ancient Greeks and then nine writers of the Church. To each of them he attached a characteristic epithet.[75] Alan of Lille, too, used this process, called a "determinatio," in his *Anticlaudianus* as well as his *De planctu naturae,* for example, where he showed each of the seven liberal arts as being represented by a particular "auctor."[76] There was a concern to note, with some degree of precision, the distinctive area of strength of each of the four great doctors in terms of one of the four senses of Scripture. Here again there were variations. In the catalog that was arranged by the librarian of the Charterhouse at Salvatorberg in the twelfth century, we read: "It is quite appropriate that Jerome should have sweated tirelessly in the field of history, Ambrose in the field of allegory, and Gregory in the field of tropology."[77] This is pretty much the arrangement arrived at by Huguccio. Similarly, it is the arrangement that

can be found in a fourteenth-century commentary on the *Allegoriae.*[78] The division made by Sixtus of Siena's poem is scarcely different.[79] Not too long after the midpoint of the twelfth century, Godfrey of Saint Victor also attaches a special attribute to each of the four doctors, and, in doing so, follows the lead of the *Fons philosophiae.* But he does this in another way, a way that is quite visual. Pursuing his metaphor of a river, he shows an army of "bridge-builders" who have set to work. These are the commentators on Scripture. Four of them stand out from among them all by virtue of their eminent role. They are seen constantly helping people to cross over from one bank of the river to the other, that is to say, from history to the spiritual sense, or from an ancient people to a new people. For the doctrine of the senses of Scripture and the doctrine of the relationship between the two Testaments are in essence one and the same thing. Here we see Gregory, who lays claim to the head of the bridge. Ambrose and Jerome, who are seated, share the two halves of it. Augustine presides over the middle: ". . . He has scouted all the bends of the river. . . ." [80]

Doubtless because of the long and venerable tradition that was encompassed by it, Sixtus of Siena's little poem achieved a real success. The Jesuit Anthony Possevin collected it in his *Bibliotheca de ratione studiorum,*[81] and the *Institutiones* of the Dominican J. M. de Turre would still be citing it at the outset of the eighteenth century.[82]

Nevertheless, the two "hexameter lines"[83] by Augustine of Dacia gained ascendancy over this poem, as it did over others. This was deservedly so. As bad as his Latin was, the distich was simple, brief, and spirited.[84] For more than five centuries it has been widely quoted by exegetes and theologians who deal with the subject. Several, beginning with Nicholas of Lyra, have produced extensive commentaries on it.[85] Like a proverb, it has found its place in the dictionaries.[86] But if it is easy to provide a firsthand interpretation of it, a literal interpretation, so to speak, it is much less easy to perceive the precise importance of it. Without speaking of certain quite excusable errors,[87] it can be said that the doctrine expressed in it or rather condensed in it has very rarely been understood to the very depths of its significance.

The author of the distich, like his predecessors, wished undoubtedly to communicate not some personal idea or "speculation" with more or less authority, but a faith-filled reflection which had been given widespread expression before his time and set in a place of honor by his master, Saint Thomas Aquinas. For him, as for everyone else, the fourfold sense was the unique privilege of inspired Scripture. Such, after him, was the conviction still of Nicholas of Lyra.[88] In their eyes, what was at stake was

the very teaching of the Church. Nevertheless, although some historians concede this to them,[89] most moderns hardly seem disposed to do so. At the time of the Reformation, these two verses became a sign of contradiction. In his commentary on Psalm 22, Luther — whom we shall have occasion to examine at greater length with reference to these verses — uses them to attack a traditional method of exegesis in the Church. These are, he declares, "impious verses." This approach of dividing up the content of Scripture into four compartments strikes him as introducing otiose and questionable divisions, which serve neither faith nor morals.[90] With just a few exceptions, all of Protestantism ended up following his lead. Rullus of Basel, for example, repudiated the "figment of the scholastics regarding the fourfold sense of Scripture,"[91] which proves that he did not make an effort to recover its authentic sense by going back to its sources. J. G. Rosenmuller, author of a grandiose history of biblical exegesis that was conceived in the spirit of the Enlightenment, would come to recognize that this "figment" was something that even the Fathers of the Church could lay claim to; but in appropriating the misunderstandings and even misconstructions of the historian Mosheim, he ends up being no less indiscriminately critical of "this absurd way of dealing with the Sacred Books"; once the ruling pattern of the four senses is conceded, he explains, "anything that a person wants can easily be extracted from Scripture."[92]

From the outset Catholic theologians reacted against attacks like these and continued firm in their resolve. They were conscious of being the defenders of more than just a habit of mind, more than just "scholasticism," more than just an idea in vogue at the time of the Fathers, more than just a cultural artifact. They were upholders of something sprung from Tradition that is divine itself, a certain fundamentally Catholic attitude in the face of the Word of God.

In his teaching at the Roman College, Cardinal Tolet, commenting on the first question of the Summa of Saint Thomas, goes so far as to maintain that the doctrine of the four senses should be construed as being an article of faith. He proves this by the common and constant custom of the Church, by the practice and doctrine of the doctor saints of the Church, notably Origen, Augustine, and Jerome, by his examination of what Scripture says itself, and finally by reason of its fittingness, which is drawn from what the Lord himself makes of it.[93]

For some time, however, Catholic authors themselves, be they historians, theologians or exegetes, have tended to be less favorable to this idea. At some further point, we shall see the causes of this reversal. For now let us be content in merely stating it. Whereas Protestants continued, with

Auguste Sabatier, for example, to treat it as a "scholastic axiom," as a theory "worthy of the scholastic period,"[94] many of the heirs of scholasticism abandoned the defense of it that had long been put forward in the Church. To the contrary, they even set about to prove that an axiom of this kind was condemned by the principles of scholasticism, that scholasticism, indeed, had given the theory its deathblow. They should, however, have steered clear of the inference that scholasticism, such as they understood it, had a strained relationship with the ancient tradition. Thus it turned out that they found themselves prompted to view the fourfold sense as nothing more than an invention of the early Middle Ages, that is to say, something relatively recent, the fruit of a barbaric era, whose vogue lasted only for a very short while. Others knew how to show that they were better historians. Father Lagrange did not hesitate to declare that this was "an ancient tradition."[95] As for Father Mandonnet, he likewise saw it as "a legacy that extended a far way back."[96] Only he was no less convinced that this was only an exegetical "process," having no more doctrinal interest than scientific value.[97] According to him, the four senses constituted "a very loose enumeration," the components of which customary usage alone had capriciously juxtaposed. This being the case, he supposed, an entirely empirical list like this offered no place to "the dogmatic matter of theology," nor, indeed, to "the speculative matter of philosophy." He was of the opinion, too, that Saint Thomas should have made the effort, an ultimately useless effort, to be sure, to introduce "a bit of logical order" into the scheme and to transform it somehow or other into "a kind of methodical classification."[98] Father Christian Pesch was of a similar opinion. In his eyes, outside of the sole and true sense of Scripture, the other senses enumerated by the Ancients were, until the salutary intervention of Saint Thomas and the other scholastics, merely "figurative sayings, artificial deductions, pure inventions," etc. In the best instances, they were simple applications of moral and ascetical principles. In other cases, they were true intellectual follies.[99] The dismissal of all the scholastic thinkers is hardly justified. It seems, moreover, that Father Pesch was too quick to transfer to the principle of the scriptural senses the unfavorable judgment that he was making, not always without reason, on the content of so many examples of ancient exegesis. Father Ferdinand Prat saw the tripartite division, "which was in use throughout the Middle Ages and even to our own times," as nothing more "than an irrational development of Origen's trichotomy." And as a result he judged it to be "at least" as bad.[100] Father Joseph de Ghellinck, doubtless recalling Protestant allegations, rescued the scholastics from the reproach of "having imagined it." It was, he said, the

result of a "much earlier" tendency. In order to be fair to it, it was necessary to see it as "an inevitable distraction for exegetes at a time when the original texts were usually a closed book."[101] Delporte, a theologian from Louvain, held it in no higher esteem. Such a classification struck him as being "entirely artificial" and to have "nothing to recommend it." Adding curiously that "it proceeds from the famous distich" that I cited at the outset, Delporte reproduced a series of objections that were directed to it.[102] These objections, themselves classic, can be found developed at great length, for example, in Perrone's *De locis theologicis.*[103]

The revival of interest that has for some years been enjoyed by problems relative to the knowledge of Scripture has not completely rehabilitated "the scholasticism of the four senses."[104] There is a concern, an assuredly fundamental concern, to rediscover a direct contact with the Word of God, and it bears some kinship to the desire to assimilate to the utmost the results of an exegesis that has made marvelous progress in a short time. It seems, too, at times, that this fundamental concern to achieve direct contact with the Word of God has been opposed to the quite historical and disinterested concern to enter completely into a system of thought that is presented in an obsolete garb in order to facilitate understanding. As always, a "new state of disciplines" creates "an unconscious obstacle . . . to the reconstruction of ancient categories."[105] The way these ancient categories are labelled becomes misleading. With regard to Hugh of Saint Victor and Pierre of Poitiers, C. Spicq declares that:

> It is worth acknowledging how much these classifications arise from pure rhetoric and the tradition of the schools. They have no usefulness for a real understanding of the text.[106]

An author as measured as Dubarle does not dare to acknowledge that the theory of the four senses has more than "some practical merits."[107] Some recent works regard the theory with greater sympathy. In this vein we have the *Introduction à la Bible,* published under the editorial direction of Messrs. Robert and Feuillet, in a chapter written by P. Grelot.[108] Nevertheless, nowadays one would, without a doubt, be hard put to find a voice that would give wholehearted endorsement to what Louis Massignon said about the theory recently:

> Despite the disfavor into which it has fallen at the present time, it is indispensable for whoever wishes to bring to life again, in its wholeness, the meditation of a believer on the sacred text.[109]

Surprisingly, this is the state of affairs in spite of the recommendation that was issued in 1893 on the part of the encyclical *Providentissimus*,[110] "that encyclical which is considered the charter, as it were, of biblical studies,"[111] from which it seemed that the theory would surely benefit.

Whatever the case may be, and whatever judgment one might wish to bring to bear on this issue, this doctrine of the fourfold sense has long been classic and unquestioned. It has provided a framework of thought for numerous generations of Christians. It is a framework that is so solid and, at the same time, so common that it can be seen fleshed out, as it were, and pressed into service as a classification system for books. The medieval charterhouse of Salvatorberg had a catalog for its library. The lengthy preface to this catalog, which was recently published by Father de Ghellinck, gives an exposition of the plan of the library and justifies it: after a first section devoted to works under the jurisdiction of "historia," there came the sections on "allegoria," "anagogia," and finally "tropologia."[112] The same framework was critical for orators, although it did not lack a measure of versatility. For a long time, theoreticians of preaching expounded on it and derived precise rules from it. At the beginning of the twelfth century, Guibert of Nogent recalls the framework in his *Liber quo ordine sermo fieri debeat*.[113] With good reason, he insists on the preponderant role played by "tropologia," which is, of the four senses, the one best adapted to the needs of the interior man. Furthermore, what the hearers lack, in this case, is less faith than morals. It may, indeed, be possible for an overly profound "allegoria" to engender error or confusion in unsubtle minds that are incapable of following the preacher, whereas solid moral instruction is accessible to all and useful to all.[114] That is why, adds Guibert, the orator cannot be content to copy certain of these commentaries that we owe to the Fathers of the Church, which are almost uniquely allegorical, because they had been compiled for the benefit, above all, of Jews and Gentiles, who were forced either to refute them or to convert.[115] Before the end of Guibert's century, there flourished an abundant literature for the use of preachers. Whether it was theoretical or practical, whether it provided preaching materials or rules, this literature was founded, to a great extent, on the fourfold sense. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, in his *Forma praedicandi*, the university man Robert de Basevorn teaches that a theme should be dealt with "in diverse manners: historically, allegorically, morally, and anagogically."[116] The same teaching occurs at the height of the scholastic period in the *Ars praedicandi* of a disciple of Saint Thomas,[117] or in an *Ars concionandi* that was long attributed to Saint Bonaventure.[118] It is hence quite natural to find, in the sermons of the

period, texts that are explained in accordance with the four senses. We find this in the sermons, for example, of Saint Bonaventure himself.[119] With the process of "distinctiones," which took their rise in a special way from the middle of the twelfth century, the allegorical form became unvarying. Now its intention was not only or even principally "to seduce by the richness of its images and the precision and skill of its transpositions, but to lay stress on and respond to questions of reflective thought."[120] Under appearances that were more and more scholastic, the allegorical form remained in its essence serious.

Besides, such a "mode of expounding on Sacred Scripture"[121] or "traditional mode of Sacred Scripture"[122] did not govern only preaching. For a long time, it was at the basis of all sacred science. Or, rather, it constituted sacred science in its entirety — in principle at least. Up to the twelfth century, it has been written, "there was no such thing as systematic theology. All theological erudition was concentrated on Exegesis . . . . With its four senses, Scripture furnished matter for the most ingenious contrivances, as well as the broadest speculations of theology and the pious affections of asceticism."[123] In the efforts at systematization that were occurring at the beginning of the twelfth century, the triple or quadruple sense determined the diverse disciplines among which the whole panoply of theological studies was obliged to be divided.[124] Indeed it contained "the whole series of things divine" or revealed, and "the whole of doctrine" could be portioned out, in its principal aspects, among each one of the senses.[125] Even if an organization of sacred knowledge like this remained mostly theoretical or was only applied with rigor during a very short time and in a restricted number of schools, the very idea is highly significant. This was shown by Fathers Paré, Brunet, and Tremblay in their work entitled *les écoles et l'enseignement au XIIe siècle*,[126] not to mention Father Spicq in his erudite *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen âge*.[127] Finally, in more recent times, M. D. Chenu established this again by analyzing the systems in which "allegoria" constitutes, he says, "the sinew of doctrinal construction."[128]

Without a doubt, while it is necessary to stress these facts, one ought not to exaggerate their importance. The methods and programs of teaching have never constituted the whole of the intellectual life. Indeed, progress in the intellectual life is not inevitably matched by progress in methods and programs of teaching. It is no less the case in theology than in other branches of knowledge that the focal points of thought are not identified simply with schools. On the other hand, it should not be readily believed that the basic doctrine of "allegoria" was merely a "theology of images,"

as some are saying today. Under a symbolic form, it gathered together, more or less happily, a heritage of deep reflection. A true effort of the intelligence has never been lacking in the Church. It had been particularly intense in the great patristic centuries, and the second part of the eleventh century marked a wonderful resurgence. However, for the subject whose study we are undertaking, the idea from which it takes its inspiration provides the most suitable framework. Furthermore, it is this idea that we are going to take as our point of departure, and from which we will later branch out in different directions.[129]

CHAPTER ONE

Theology, Scripture, and the Fourfold Sense

1. Discipline

As the twelfth century was ushered in, it had been acknowledged for some time that there were traditional rules which were absolutely essential for anybody who set himself the task of interpreting Scripture. The seven "mystical rules" that had been formulated long ago by Tyconius, given authority by Augustine, and rendered popular by Saint Isidore were widely recognized.[1] Nor could one ignore the fact that the Apostle Paul himself had by his own example given a "rule that could act as a guide for understanding allegorical explanations."[2] This guiding rule, pertaining as it did to allegory ("allegoria"), was not the same as the one that governed history ("historia"); the ordering principle ("ordo") history was quite different.[3] For this reason it was acknowledged that there were "laws governing history,"[4] that there was a "consequential pattern to allegory,"[5] and that there were "explanations of an anagogical nature."[6] These are all turns of phrase that date from the time of the Fathers.[7] It is true, no doubt, that the other senses of Scripture admitted of a "freer aspect" than did history. Even while Saint Jerome registers his protest against the excessive liberties that he feels were taken by Eusebius of Caesarea,[8] he follows Origen in arriving at this estimation of allegory as something that enjoys a freer rein.[9] This line of thought is even more evident when he talks about tropology.[10] Many who followed in the wake of Jerome reiterated his argument. For them tropology is endowed with wide and spacious vistas.

Using expressions that are also derived from Jerome, William of Auvergne explains that tropology is "circumscribed only by the requirement that it be accompanied by piety in its intellectual and discursive coherence."[11] "History is hedged in by constraints, while tropology is free-wheeling."[12] This freedom that tropology enjoys is not itself, however, unimpeded by rules:[13] "By way of tropology, which is to say, in accordance with the rules of moral understanding," pronounces the Venerable Bede.[14] Sigebert of Gembloux observes that: "this freedom should have some means of advancing and making progress."[15] For this reason, it is not sufficient that the interpretation should be "pious"; if it turns out that the relationship of tropology to history and to allegory is not firmly fixed, if the context is not respected, and if connections are established between things that are too widely disparate, then the interpretation should not be said to be "pious" in the true sense of the word.[16] Even in the wake of all the interpretations that had been handed down by the Fathers, there were doubtless pathways that remained open to exploration. It was still possible in many ways to attempt new interpretations or to continue the work of the Fathers. Nevertheless, anyone who did not prepare himself for such an enterprise by a lengthy process of training ran the risk of going astray.[17]

After Cassian, there was a tendency to be censorious toward the reader who, without study, without method, and without consistency, jumped from one text to another in his search for some spiritually uplifting thought, and who "was pulled this way and that, as he wandered with erratic instability through all the pages of Scripture."[18] There was widespread agreement with Cassian that "anyone who is only superficial in the fawning flattery he pays the spiritual senses and merely skims their surface, taking samples here and there,"[19] would never become a true "possessor"[20] of them.

What was at stake was more than mere respect for a tradition. If students of Scripture were not allowed to betray spiritual understanding to imaginary fancies, and if they were not allowed, moreover, to make spiritual understanding a rhetorical or improvisational enterprise whose timeliness was fleeting and ephemeral,[21] this was because spiritual understanding had its own objective structure, or, to use a term that was still current, its "own distinctive characteristics."[22] For there was no doubt that, in the reality of things, there existed an "ordering principle that stemmed from a divine dispensation"[23] and that as a result there was a systematic order that needed to be observed in the examination of mysteries.[24] In a similar vein, there was talk of the four senses or the four understandings

of Sacred Scripture, as well as its "four ruling principles"[25] and its "four rules of interpretation."[26]

In his vastly ambitious program to reorganize education, Hugh of Saint Victor introduced precision and detail to such ideas. He endeavored to deduce a complete method of theological training from them. Using language that was already technical, he spoke of the student who "approached the reading of Sacred Scripture in order to be educated."[27] To this student he assigns the stage of "history," which is the object of what he calls the "first cycle of instructions."[28] After "history" there ensues the stage of "allegory," which is the object of the "second cycle of instructions."[29] He observes that the order which must be followed and the procedures which need to be put into place are necessarily different from one stage to the other, and it is precisely in order to prepare for the transition from the first to the second "cycle of instructions" that he drafts his *De sacramentis*.[30] Thus the object of this immense work is to introduce students to allegory. "Hugh's primary intention," claims Roger Baron, "is not to write a treatise the elementary framework of which Scripture would be forced to provide. To the contrary, he wants this treatise to be an introduction to 'divine eloquence' ('divina eloquia'). As the arts are to philosophy, and as philosophy is to divine knowledge, divine knowledge is to Scripture."[31] Nevertheless, there is a third cycle of instructions or "eruditio" that is still indispensable, namely, "moral instruction."[32] For the theorist of Saint Victor does not collapse biblical studies, in either their spirit or their method, into profane studies. He knows that the knowledge of Scripture is not ordered to some higher knowledge, but that, even so, it is not an end in itself either. He does not forget that Scripture is given to us with a view to "education in morals."[33] He also recalls, not only in his spiritual writings, but also in his didactic account of things, that in the cultivation of knowledge extreme care should be taken not to neglect discipline,[34] and that discipline is no less in keeping with Scripture than knowledge.

Let us turn to the word "disciplina." Outside of a certain technical usage in classifying the branches of scientific knowledge and in scholastic organization,[35] a usage that we can lay aside at this point, the word had borrowed a certain resonance or, it could even be said, a practical, emphatic significance from the biblical tradition. The debt that "disciplina" owed to the biblical tradition is even more evident than its debt to the Greek tradition of "paideia" ("educatio"), which is close to our notion of "culture." "Disciplina" would often be encountered in the wisdom books. In the Book of Wisdom it has many, different dimensions, implying, "warn-

ing, correction, instruction, education, discipline, as well as moral and religious formation."[36] One of the titles of the Book of Ecclesiastes was "The Book of Discipline."[37] In the Latin translation of the *Adversus Haereses* we find a reference to "the transmission of the law, which is well-fitted to those who are still undisciplined."[38] For Saint Ambrose[39] the "order of discipline"[40] was, as it was for Saint Gregory,[41] the "rule of discipline, the "teaching role of discipline," or the "discipline of an interior watchfulness."[42] It was the means by which the virtuous man becomes firm in his mastery of self, or "the discipline of living," "the fullness of discipline."[43] The unstable man, said Cassian, does nothing and receives nothing "in a disciplined way."[44] By recourse to a kind of pleonasm Saint Peter Damian, like Saint Gregory, refers to "discipline of life."[45] Liturgical texts designated ritual fasting as a "disciplined, spiritual observance."[46] The discipline that arises from the Gospel, moreover, is exalted in practical terms. And, in more particular respects, we find that the discipline of Christian monasticism is sovereign over Jewish discipline or the philosophical disciplines of the Gentiles.[47] And still in a practical vein, this discipline that arises from the Gospel can be distinguished from that of the Jews and Gentiles by its "intentio," even though there are certain common traits that it clearly shares with them. And what is more, in this discipline of the Gospel there is a discernible school of "Christian philosophy,"[48] that "true philosophy" which is "the yoke of the Lord." In a treatise entitled *On the Goodness of Discipline*,[49] Valerian of Cimelium took the word in its extended sense, arguing that discipline corrects morals and teaches piety. Created first by God, he maintained, it contains and orders all things. Even animals observe its ordering power. We are obliged to love it, for it is in yielding to it that we find Christ.[50] In a sermon entitled "On Christian Discipline," Saint Augustine spoke of the Church of God as a "house of discipline," into which no "want of discipline" ("indisciplinatio") should find its way.[51]

Beginning with the time of the Fathers, we find the following catchwords recurring constantly: "the discipline of God,"[52] "the discipline of Christ,"[53] "the discipline of the Lord," and "the Lord's discipline."[54] Related phrases include: "the discipline of religion,"[55] "the discipline of Christianity,"[56] "the discipline of the Church,"[57] and "the discipline of divine law."[58] All of these expressions are quite often very nearly synonymous. Cyprian's *Testimonia* had spoken of "the religious discipline of our sect."[59] Anastasius I,[60] who was followed by Saint Avitus, had invoked the notion of "Catholic discipline."[61] There was still ready talk of "a saving discipline,"[62] or of discipline as something "heavenly,"[63] "coming from on high,"[64] or "divine."[65] The "discipline of the Fathers"[66] and, in particular,

"evangelical and apostolic discipline"[67] were given as a rule or example. Constant deference was paid to "ruling discipline,"[68] to "ruling disciplines,"[69] and to "the rule of discipline."[70] All of these expressions amounted, once again, to a series of pleonasms, for anything that is disciplined is by definition endowed with a rule, is "composed," methodical, and cadenced,[71] so to speak. However, these expressions that we have just rehearsed alluded in the main to the rules of religious orders. A broader appeal was launched by referring to "the discipline of religious discussion."[72] The terms of reference became broader still through allusions to "the discipline of morality,"[73] "the discipline of morals,"[74] and "the discipline of the virtues."[75] These terms of reference were broken down still further into "the discipline of patience,"[76] "the discipline of temperance," "the discipline of charity,"[77] and "the discipline of humility."[78] The *Rule of Saint Benedict* drew a parallel between the ascendant degrees of humility and those of discipline.[79] The celebrated Roswitha, even though she described herself as "ignorant and not fit for any kind of righteousness and goodness," recognized that God had made her an "animal capable of discipline."[80] It was acknowledged that it would be sheer vanity to suppose that one could become holy without submitting oneself to "disciplina," or that one could achieve sanctity by resisting the "goad of discipline."[81] The following proverb was often repeated: "Whoever rejects discipline will quickly come to ruin."[82] This single word "disciplina" was enough to evoke the notion of good morals and a whole panoply of solid virtues.[83] Saint Hildegard recommended "disciplinary submission," which is to say, an initiation into the practice of obedience.[84] Constant and unfailing vigilance was necessary in the struggle against "a breakdown of discipline,"[85] "an undisciplined life,"[86] or, as Saint Gregory phrased it, "a ruinous want of discipline."[87] There was a whole "discipline of tradition and social intercourse,"[88] which constituted a code of customs, as it were, for the Christian life, one that was more complete than the "discipline arising from canonical regulations."[89] Under the dispensation of the Old Testament, there had been "the discipline of law,"[90] but in today's world Christians were governed by "the discipline of the Church,"[91] to which Saint Gregory made frequent appeal.[92] Adam of Perseigne wrote that: "Discipline puts the exterior man in order."[93] But, beyond that, it was recognized that there was "an experience of discipline"[94] that was more interior. It was with joy that the true Christian bore the "yoke of spiritual discipline."[95] He was armed against every evil by "a discipline of life."[96] "O mistress of discipline!" exclaims Blessed Hermann Joseph (1150-1241) in addressing the Virgin Mary.[97]

The rule of monastic life, which was modelled on the rule of the first Christian community at Jerusalem, was itself said to be a form of "apostolic discipline."[98] Such a rule prompted the monk to live under a discipline that was "spiritual" and "sacred."[99] It was "a sociable discipline."[100] One of the Ekkehards of Saint Gall speaks lovingly of "evangelical discipline" in his *Life* of the first Notker, Blessed Notker the Stammerer.[101] The rule of monastic life was also called "the discipline of the cloister,"[102] "monastic discipline,"[103] "the discipline of the monastery,"[104] or "the discipline of monks."[105] It was "a system of disciplinary observance,"[106] which included among its principal articles "the discipline of silence."[107] Cassian had been lavish in his praise of "the supreme heights of anchoritic discipline," without, however, being scornful of "cenobitic discipline."[108] Saint Columban, who, in one of his instructions, contrasts "the disciplinary framework of our school" with all "the temporal kinds of disciplines," went so far as to confer the title of "discipline of disciplines" on monastic life.[109] In exalting "the discipline of wisdom,"[110] which, as we have seen, gives shape to "Christian philosophy," it was not at all Guerric of Igny's intention to exalt a certain kind of speculative thought. Rather, he wanted to extol the perfect life cultivated in cloisters.[111] Petrus Alphonsus drafted a work to which he gave the title of *Clerical Discipline* because, he claimed, the opinions that he registered in it, even while disguising them as fables, were intended to produce "a disciplined cleric."[112] In his treatise entitled *On Disciplinary Vigor,*[113] Elmer of Canterbury wanted to bring about a union of that vigorous strength which arises from discipline with a zealous attachment to doctrine, and boasted of his effectiveness at "putting a restraining curb on hard hearts."[114] In the *Life of Saint Wolfgang* it is recounted that he formed children not only in "good and beautiful doctrines" but also in "the moral disciplines."[115] Already as early as Tertullian, who made great use of the word, we find a clear distinction between discipline and doctrine in his belief that "discipline is an index of doctrine."[116] When it was a question of assigning responsibilities of a delicate nature, the *Precepts of Pachomius,* which were translated by Saint Jerome, called for a man "whose faith and discipline are of proven worth."[117] Saint Augustine spoke in the same vein.[118] Following his example, Saint Prosper said: "Teach discipline by teaching patience, teach knowledge by illuminating the understanding."[119] What the priest cannot obtain "by discoursing about doctrine," Saint Isidore noted, the power of princes achieves "by imposing disciplinary fear."[120] Aponius made a distinction between "the praise of discipline" and "the praise of knowledge."[121] Bede and Rabanus Maurus likewise distinguished between "the wisdom of true and

right dogma" and "the discipline of pure and unsullied social dealings."[122] One of the annalists of Saint Gall praised those religious who had made "knowledge and discipline"[123] the ornament of their monastery. Another annalist declared that: "Religion goes hand in hand with doctrine, while strictness goes hand in hand with discipline."[124] In very much the same way, Rupert of Deutz distinguished between "the magisterial authority of the faith" and "moral discipline."[125] Those associated with the Abbey of Saint Victor drew a parallel between "true doctrine" and "disciplined virtue,"[126] and even between "the eager zeal for reading" and "the discipline of work."[127] For them this was a way of returning to the traditional distinction between contemplation and action, symbolized by Rachel and Leah[128] — although it was possible for the "speculative disciplines" to prepare the groundwork for contemplation itself and to give it guiding direction.[129] It was their opinion that the learned man should not only be wise but disciplined, since it is "only when he lives a disciplined life himself that he rightly imposes discipline on others."[130] William of Saint Thierry remarked that the acquisition of knowledge normally demands "a disciplined social life," that is to say, a routine of life that facilitates social dealings, "a system of social commerce."[131] A monk of the twelfth century wrote: "We take up matters of doctrine in Church, while matters of discipline are taken up in chapter."[132] Petrus Cellensis exhorted the religious superior to fill a dual role for his sons, encouraging him to be a "rod of Aaron" in his reliance on discipline and a "table of the Lord" in his recourse to doctrine.[133] In similar fashion, Thomas of Perseigne contrasted the "ponderous weight of discipline" with the "truth of doctrine," even while he yoked them together as a pair.[134] In this way, the original unity of the two concepts was something that was no longer felt at all.

Thus it happened that discipline became distinct not only from knowledge, but also prudence and wisdom. There always proved to be a need, however, for discipline to be joined to these notions.[135] Essentially, it was the austere part of education. "It is healthy to add a dose of discipline to a diet of sweet reasonableness," proffered Saint Augustine, who noted that the word "disciplina" was a translation of the Greek word "paideia."[136] As a result, the notion of discipline included an inevitable element of training and shaping.[137] Thus it carried connotations of "toughness,"[138] which is what kept it closely allied to the ancient idea of "military discipline."[139] It was with this in mind that Bede could claim that "we struggle against the devil under the disciplinary standard of Christ the King."[140] This world was a place of "hard discipline," which prepared the way for "the sweet rewards that come from within."[141] As it came to

maturity, the "bitter seed of discipline" was bound to yield "fruit in the form of spiritual joys."[142] Since this was the case, the whole matter came down to a question of "toilsome discipline."[143] This is why, in the case of Saint Bernard, we find ourselves reading expressions like the following: "not able to endure discipline," or "showing disciplined strictness."[144] Caesarius of Arles thought that it was sometimes necessary to use the "rod of discipline," when it became the only means of making certain cloistered nuns "disciplined."[145] The rule of Saint Benedict foresaw the need for a "disciplinary reproof,"[146] which meant punishment, while Saint Gregory envisaged the necessity of "disciplinary correction with canonical weight,"[147] which meant a canonical penalty. Saint Bruno of Segni alludes to a "disciplinary administration of the lash."[148] A collection of exegetical writings that dates to the beginning of the thirteenth century speaks of "the wine of discipline and correction."[149] Sometimes the word was also understood in its most material sense, and this was a sense that managed to cling to it. It is in a figurative sense yet that we find Hadrian II speaking of the "rod of discipline,"[150] and Lupus of Ferrières speaking of those who endure a "disciplinary scourging."[151] But we find somewhat later that the "rod of discipline" or simply "the discipline" has become a penitential tool or else the use it is put to, namely, "flogging."[152] This is also true in the work of Saint Peter Damian, who seems to have made hay out of this meaning and who also speaks of "disciplinary scourging."[153] In the *Life of Saint John Gualbert* the issue arises of a guilty person who "was publicly disciplined with hard knocks and blows."[154] The first statutes of the Premonstratensians regulated the use of "corporal discipline" in the Chapter.[155] Taking his inspiration from a text of Proverbs, Guigues, the Carthusian, took the opportunity to write the following in one of his *Meditations:* "Thus the rod should not be put away altogether, so long as there remains a boy who needs discipline."[156] Hélinand of Froidmont speaks of the "disciplinary scourge."[157] In the two knives of circumcision Adam Scotus sees figurative representations of "discipline" and "compunction."[158] While discipline is directed at the body, compunction aims at the soul.[159] In more general terms, under this heading of rough "correction" ("castigatio"), the notion of discipline was found to include the ideas of "harsh discipline,"[160] "disciplinary fear,"[161] and "harsh, disciplinary measures."[162] Thus it was that discipline approximated justice rather than mercy.[163] This being so, the ideal of the Christian leader was to temper justice with mercy, so as to achieve "a discipline that was coupled with gentleness."[164] In this way, the rule of Providence was set up as an example to be imitated, inasmuch as Providence never punishes us except in an

effort to get us to change our ways through "a therapeutic application of discipline," as Origen puts it, and it causes us to experience, for our own good, a "father's rule of discipline":[165] "O discipline that comes from God! How good and sweet you are!"[166]

There is no doubt but that it was quite necessary to make use of the "yoke" and the "restraining bit" of discipline. It was even necessary at times to go so far as to act with ruthless harshness by turning to discipline's chastening "scythe." Saint Gregory, who acknowledged this, wished nonetheless always to maintain a "disciplinary moderation."[167] Werner of Saint-Blaise criticizes "the irascible teachers" whose actions are quite the opposite of this moderation. Such teachers are forgetful of Christian law. "By giving vent to their raging fury, they transform the path of discipline into something savage and barbaric."[168] One of the Proverbs of Othloh of Saint Emmeran states:

> When discipline and mercy are uncoupled, they can bring on much ruin and loss. Discipline should not exclude mercy from its reckoning, nor should mercy leave out discipline.[169]

Adam of Perseigne distinguishes three meanings of the word "discipline." "Discipline," he remarks, can be "knowledge," or a "systematic, ordered severity," or even "an endurance of tribulations."[170] It was possible, moreover, to use the word "discipline" to characterize the law of Moses. In this case, the "book of discipline" was opposed to the "book of nature" on the one hand and to the "book of grace" on the other hand.[171] It was also possible to determine the relationship of discipline to faith. Thus "disciplinary correction" was harmonized with "the fundamental elements of a simple faith."[172] Fidelity to the Church presupposed acceptance of its faith and its discipline.[173] The "discipline of faith" itself,[174] or "the Church's discipline of faith,"[175] entailed an element of submission. It was a "Catholic discipline"[176] that barred the way to temptations of heresy and was opposed to its "false discipline."[177] It was not, however, something purely intellectual. This was no less true of the "discipline of wisdom,"[178] or of what John of Salisbury, using an expression that comes from the *Saturnales* of Macrobius, called "philosophy, the discipline of disciplines."[179] Briefly, and this is what I wanted to get at in the main, there was a natural link, in the exposition of the four senses of Scripture, between "discipline" and "tropology." "Multiple and varied" as it was, like tropology, discipline was very salutary.[180] The *Ordinary Gloss* does not fail to underline this link.[181] Let us note a last example. This example expresses

a thought that will recur in a thousand forms over the course of this study: Jesus on the cross, says Petrus Cellensis, is for all of us "a disciplinary rule of peace."[182]

Hugh of Saint Victor speaks a fair bit about "disciplina." His language, though, does not yield a pattern of perfect coherence — doubtless because he tends to cite certain traditional texts without modifying them, and doubtless also on account of the equilibrium that he tends to maintain in his methodology no less than in his doctrine, as we shall have occasion to observe further on. Drawing on the pattern of meaning that we have just reviewed, he points out the teachings of the saints "that touch on our approach to discipline."[183] On diverse grounds he opposes discipline to both art[184] and knowledge or science.[185] Following Saint Augustine, he sees the guiding principle of it in humility.[186] As is the case with Bernard of Chartres, humility appears no less necessary to him for the work of the mind than the desire for knowledge and the "taste for research."[187] How much truer this presupposition is when we approach Scripture, hoping by it to enter into "the way of truth" and "an understanding of the secrets of God"![188] But all of this does not prevent Hugh from supposing that Scripture ought no less to be the object of methodical study, where the successive application of intelligence and understanding to history, to allegory, and to tropology constitutes, in another sense, three distinct "disciplines."[189] By an equivalence that can be found in the writings of Alcuin,[190] these three disciplines are almost synonymous in this instance with the three "stages of learning." They integrate the whole body of sacred knowledge. But, even though it connotes an instruction along theoretical lines, "learning" ("eruditio") itself, which is the polar opposite of "uncultured coarseness" ("ruditas"),[191] does not appear to be divorced from all moral and religious implications.

2. Scripture and Revelation

This methodological approach to theology on the part of Hugh of Saint Victor serves merely to systematize a widely diffused practice. It presupposes and highlights the dual conviction that was universal in the Church for a long time. This conviction is, in fact, still universal and always will be so. Its two tenets are, on the one hand, that all of divine revelation is contained in Scripture and, on the other hand, that in the interpretation of this selfsame body of Scripture all of theological science is encompassed.

It was an almost unanimously held proposition, right up to the eve

of the Reformation, that Scripture contains all of revelation in the sense, at least, that we shall be dealing with.[1] For this reason, Scripture constituted the very "grounds for theology" and was not simply "a theological link of the highest importance." At that point in the history of the Church, Saint Anselm had just restated this truth: "There is nothing that we preach with profit for the salvation of souls that Sacred Scripture, fertilized as it is by the miraculous action of the Holy Spirit, has not made known or does not contain within itself."[2] Rupert, Honorius, Anselm of Laon, Arnaud of Bonneval, and others reiterate this proposition.[3] Without Scripture, the whole world would be plunged into the obscurity of deep-shadowed darkness.[4] There is, besides, the statement that proposes the following equivalence of weight and value: "according to the Catholic faith or according to Sacred Scripture."[5] And we find this simple affirmation: "Holy Scripture, the mistress of our faith."[6] There is no doubt that it has always been conceded that traditions have existed which are universal or local and that it is possible for these traditions to provide the basis for laws.[7] Nobody, though, ever spoke of two "sources" of faith that would have been parallel and radically distinct — and, whatever authors who read its texts too quickly and superficially may say of it, the Council of Trent did not do so either. It recalls, in utterly evangelical and traditional terms,[8] that Christ has commanded the Gospel[9] to be preached to every creature, inasmuch as it is *the fountainhead ("fontem")* of all revealed truth.[10] The negations of the Protestant reformers merely prompted Catholic theology to shift its emphasis, as the task of explaining ancient doctrines was undertaken, in a bid to preserve their fullness and authenticity, which were being endangered. Thus it ended up that the concept of Tradition had to be explained with more care, in a way that ran parallel to the way in which Scripture was conceptualized. But there was no essential change that resulted from this. For when it came to Scripture, such as it had always been understood, there was no question of the Holy Books being considered merely human documents, in purely material terms, so to speak, documents that lent themselves to religious or scientific examination by just anyone, without any other terms of reference. Right from the beginning, in the first century of the Church's existence, at the time of the very first generation of Christians, it was a matter of Scripture being read or the word of God being heard in Church and interpreted by Tradition. This was the "Tradition of the Apostles," precisely as spoken of by Irenaeus[11] and then Origen[12] with incomparable power. This brings us back very clearly to the Gospel envisaged by the Council of Trent. It was a question of the "Bread of Life" broken for us and "chewed" already, as

it were, by the "teeth" of "apostolic tradition."[13] This was the tradition that one was duty bound to adhere to. This was the tradition from which one was duty bound to receive the knowledge of Scripture, as if it came from the Lord himself.[14] The true disciple of Jesus, said Origen, is the person who enters his house, which is to say, the Church. "He enters it by thinking and living according to the mind of the Church," and this is the way that he understands the Word of the Lord.[15] This is the place where, at the end of time, said Saint Gregory, everybody comes to eat bread in the house of Job. Which is to say that all men are invited to nourish themselves with the pure wheaten loaves of Scripture in the Holy Church. It is in the Holy Church that they find Scripture's pithy core of mystical meaning hidden as by a veil beneath its letters.[16] Scripture may also be thought of as that great eagle which figures in one of the visions of the Book of Revelation. The two unfolded wings of this eagle are the two Testaments. The woman is borne away on the eagle's wings. This signifies that the two Testaments are given to the Church and made intelligible to her, so that she may have the means to lift up her heart to heaven.[17] In another passage, Saint John sees the Temple of God opening up in the heavens. On this occasion, the Temple is Scripture and the heavens are the Church, since "the sacramental mysteries that are figuratively portrayed in Scripture are fully disclosed only in the Church."[18] Alternatively, if we draw our inspiration from the Psalms, we can compare Scripture to the heavens. In that case, we can say that the Lord has covered the heavens with a veil of clouds, but that through the ministry of those who are charged with the responsibility of laying them open to us, these clouds are transformed into a fruitful rain.[19] Now first and foremost this was the ministry of the Apostles:

> Through the ministry of the twelve Apostles, the foundations of Scripture's New Testament were established for us, and the mysteries of the Old Record were revealed by a gift of the Lord.[20]

This is now the ministry of the successors of the Apostles, the shepherds and authorized doctors of the Church.[21] Therefore, we do not need any other nourishment than what is to be found in the Promised Land: "Milk and honey signify the Old and New Testaments in the Church."[22] In later times, the modern Jesuit writer Antoine Possevin would come to enumerate our four traditional senses and affirm that "they are all to be sought in the bosom of the Church, which is the prop and pillar of truth."[23] Or yet again we have the ancient writer who used a different metaphor,

but expressed the same thought: "Sinai should be interpreted as a bramble-bush, because it signifies the Church, in which the Lord also speaks to Moses."[24]

In other words, according to this traditional concept of Scripture, it was always a question of Scripture "as it was dealt with in the Catholic faith."[25] Any reading of the Holy Books had to be an "authentic reading." Which is to say that they had to be read with their traditional glosses as guaranteed by the authority of God in the Church. The violation of this general and supreme rule, which followed the norm already laid down by the Second Letter of Peter, was the very sign of heresy.[26] For "there is no doubt that there can never be a correct interpretation of the Scriptures without the Magisterial Authority of the one who has inspired them,"[27] which is to say, without the interior teaching of the Spirit, whose inbreathing abandons anyone who separates himself from the Church. What is more, it is Mother Church who has the key of David at her disposal: "Sacred Scripture has been written for none other than the sons of God, and it is to these that Mother Church, using the key of David, lays open all that is closed."[28] Her two breasts, or rather the two breasts of her Spouse, are the two testaments.[29] She has "the eyes of a dove," which are able, "with a simple and chaste look," to discern "the spiritual and divine senses" of Scripture.[30] "The Church proffers her reading and holds fast to it":[31] according to the ancient perspective on the matter, these two phrases contain the whole rule of faith.

As a result, theological science and the explication of Scripture cannot but be one and the same thing. In its most profound and far-reaching sense this estimation of the situation remains true even to our own day.[32] But in its stricter and more immediate sense, this idea flourished right to the eve of the thirteenth century. The vocabulary, which still remains as a witness to this state of affairs, may strike us as quite curious at first glance. But the great scholastics remained faithful to it. "Sacred Scripture, which is called theology," says Saint Bonaventure.[33] And similarly Saint Thomas speaks of "Theology, which is called Sacred Scripture."[34] We know, too, that in the first Question of the *Summa theologica*, the two expressions "sacred doctrine" and "Sacred Scripture" are used alternately, as equivalents.[35] In the previous era it had been more truly the case that the scholar was a commentator, and dogma was a kind of exegesis. As a result, we have, for example, this verse eulogy of Alberic, the Archbishop of Rheims:

> He opened doorways to what is new,
> Although he did not keep silent about the ancient truths,

And thus he brought to the light of day
What had been hidden by a literal reading of the old and new Scriptural texts.
He was the foremost guide in the city of Rheims when it came to dealing with great and boundless dogma,
For he laid open the secrets of the two Testaments.[36]

Saint Augustine's *On Christian Doctrine*,[37] a profoundly influential document, was essentially, as is widely acknowledged, a treatise on hermeneutics. Knowledge of the faith amounted to knowledge of Scripture.[38] Christian dogmas were said to be "dogmas of Divine Scripture."[39] Or else it was said, to draw on Saint Jerome's terminology, that "ecclesiastical" dogmas, which were taught by the leaders of the Church, were none other than "solemn Scriptural obligations."[40] In an attempt to show that it is sometimes difficult to discern where true doctrine is to be found, Jerome goes on to say that "it is difficult to fathom where Scripture's sealed wellspring and enclosed garden might be."[41] In the language of Saint Gregory the Great, "knowledge of divine doctrine" resided in the teaching given by Scripture,[42] and the saintly Pope could not conceive of any other "theology" than a theology that consists of "instruction in the mysteries of sacred eloquence."[43] For someone like Saint Julian of Toledo, the pundit or the man who possesses "knowledge of the law" and "understands the reasons for every mystery" was the man who "knows the law according to both its spirit and letter."[44] All doctrinal teaching was "an explication of the Scriptures."[45] All doctrine and all discipline were handed down "according to the tradition of Sacred Scripture."[46] When Notker the Stammerer took it on himself to compile a catalog of the main theologians, he gave it the following title: "Observations on the illustrious men who made a careful exposition of Sacred Scripture and gave opportune explanations of certain decisions on the part of divine authority."[47] Later, when Saint Bernard assumed the task of crushing Abelard's errors in dogmatic theology, he wrote as follows, in a preamble worthy of Bossuet in every respect: "In France we have a new theologian who is taking his rise in place of the old master, and right from the time he came of age he has dabbled in the art of dialectics, and now *he is making an unwholesome shambles of the pages of Sacred Scripture.*"[48]

Furthermore, what we today call the development of dogma or theology was readily considered to be a fruit of "the knowledge of Scripture."[49] Thanks to the zeal applied to it by commentators, this knowledge fostered "innumerable understandings,"[50] even as it remained one in itself.

"Inasmuch as it is authoritative, truth bears fruit, and when truth is discussed with care and due attention, we learn that it gives rise to ideas that are themselves truthful."[51] This was the point of view of Saint Gregory,[52] as it had been of Saint Augustine.[53] This remained the point of view yet, in the ninth century, of Jonas of Orleans (†843). Whereas Gregory had used it as a point of departure to expand on the biblical metaphor of the ornaments of the bride, Jonas speaks of branches that have been trimmed off in the forest:

> Let him realize that the ancient Fathers penetrated deep into the forest of Holy Scripture and cut countless different branches of sound faith out of it. Making use of these branches, they issued formulas of salvation that are of benefit to many and perform an honored role in God's service.[54]

At about the same time, a similar point of view was expressed by a commentator on the fourth gospel, who highlighted it by expanding on the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves:

> There were five loaves that he used to satisfy the multitude of people, and there are five books of Moses. When these books have been laid open by being approached with a spiritual understanding and they have been multiplied so as to yield an abundance of meanings, he restores and refreshes the hearts of faithful listeners every day.[55]

And in order to express this truth, which is no less ancient in the Church, namely, that there will always be a treasure house of Christian doctrine to draw on, there will always be new aspects of doctrine to bring to light and new applications of it to be deduced, Irimbert of Admont urged men to turn to the example of Ruth and always be busy gleaning in the field of Scriptures, claiming that: "Right to the end, men will be applying themselves to the task of seeking out and explaining the secret depths of Sacred Scripture."[56] In our own day, we are taking note once again of the providential role that heresy has played in the development of dogma. It was precisely this role, which had been recognized for a long time, that received special attention as the knowledge of the Holy Books came to be more deeply plumbed. This was the case with Hincmar of Rheims in his refutation of Godescalc: what a happy necessity it is to respond to heretics! It is this necessity that precipitates a discovery and

acceptance of a great fund of meaning that has hitherto remained hidden, to the vast majority of people, at least.[57] Similar, too, was the position of Manegold of Lautenbach toward the end of the eleventh century. In that "heart of God" spoken of by the Psalmist, Manegold sees Scripture, "inasmuch as Scripture contains hidden, interior mysteries about God." Heretics draw near to this "heart," and they do this so aptly that faithful Catholics see themselves as being obliged to investigate it more and more closely, in order to refute them. Then this "heart of God" itself approaches them and grants them more and more knowledge. In this way one understands the Apostle's dictum that "it is fitting that there should be heresies."[58] The idea is especially identified with Saint Augustine, who had given vent to it several times:

> Why is it that his heart drew near? It was so that we might come to an understanding of what he wants. And it is a fact that the Catholic faith is affirmed through heretics, since it is through people who have bad ideas that people with good ideas are made more credible. For many things were hidden in the Scriptures. And it so happened that, when the heretics were nipped and cut short, they shook the Church with their questions. In this way, things that were hidden were laid open to view, and the will of God was understood.[59]

The same idea was taken up by Rupert of Deutz at the beginning of the twelfth century in another context:

> For in reality the princes and leaders of our faith, orthodox, Catholic men as they were, were incited by their disputes with heretics to make a more intense study of the depths of the Scriptures, and so it was that "using their staffs, they dug and established" a well of living water. . . . The staffs of the princes or leaders of our people, which they used to dig a well "through the giver of the law," consisted of strong and persistent minds. With such minds the teachers of the Church fought against the blasphemies of the heretics and laid open for us the truth of the Scriptures "through the giver of the law," that is to say, with the help of God's grace . . . . This was all because the leaders and princes were busy doing their digging, because they faithfully explained Sacred Scripture and made it intelligible to us.[60]

We find quite similar reflections somewhat later in Hugh of Saint Victor:

> The Lord uses heretics to fulfill his intentions, because, while they may draw some of the Church to their errors, others become firmer in their faith and their perception of truth. For this reason, it follows that: "He has fulfilled the words of my mouth," which he had anticipated from days of old. For truly the words of God's mouth, which he had anticipated from days of old, are understood to be Sacred Scripture, which has been proclaimed to the world for quite some while now. But still Scripture is to a large extent hidden. Day by day it is being fulfilled in the minds of the faithful, when they, prompted as they are by the questions of heretics, grow ever more zealous in their pursuit of the virtues, and they make progress towards a deeper understanding of divine eloquence.[61]

We find a similar and not unrelated situation when we look at what would, in our day and age, be called theological pluralism within the unifying matrix of faith. At that time, this idea derived its foundations from the multiplicity of senses offered by a Scriptural text that could never be directly comprehended in all its depths. For example, this is what a Celtic catechism of the eighth century (?) tells us in its commentary on the phrase: "In my Father's house there are many mansions":[62]

> The eloquence of Sacred Scripture takes many shapes, and its meanings are many and varied. For this reason someone has said: He compares things that are celestial with things that are earthly, so that likenesses that we find well-known and familiar may provide a field of play for the things that incomprehensible greatness veils from our understanding. For there is a marvelous power in the way that the words of Scripture are knit together. In this way, great and incomprehensible matters are unfolded to us in two or three passages.[63]

This kind of pluralism was explained as being justified by the legitimacy of different allegorical explanations, provided that, in the final analysis, they were directed at the same object: "Because there may be a variety of different meanings, Sacred Scripture can be understood as referring to one and the same thing in several modes, provided that there is no withdrawal from the unity of faith."[64] These words of Adam Scotus enunciate the principle on which Anselm of Havelberg and his adversary Nicetas of Nicomedia had come to an agreement in the course of a famous debate.[65] It was a principle to be recalled many times after Saint Augustine,[66] Saint Gregory,[67] and Saint Isidore of Seville[68] had had occasion to express it.

Saint Columban expressed it in his turn, when he observed that orthodox authors "used different kinds of language to unveil the sacraments of faith in the Old and New Testaments."[69] Hervaeus of Bourg Dieu made a vigorous attempt to justify the principle by claiming that "the many-sided understanding" is always an "an understanding of the mystery of Christ," provided that it conforms with the explanations of the Holy Fathers.[70] "Doctrine may be many-sided, even while truth remains the same," writes Hugh of Saint Victor.[71] Gilbert Foliot endorses the thinking of one of his correspondents, which he summarizes in the following terms: "The many-shaped loveliness of God's word in all its simplicity is not meant to be acknowledged by pious sentiments alone, but appreciation of it should be deepened by drawing on various figurative expressions of doctrine."[72] For Alexander of Neckam, too, "there are as many luminous ways of understanding and interpreting Sacred Scripture as there are explanations of it."[73] And each of these explanations has its value, since it rests on "the foundations of faith"; if these foundations eroded, however, the explanation would be reduced to something false and subjective.[74] This idea was universally accepted.[75] To the extent that it represents something essential, it has always appeared indispensable to the equilibrium and vitality of Christian thought. This is precisely because it conveys a consciousness of the transcendence of faith.

In more general terms, when a person wanted to talk about "expounding traditional doctrine," he talked of "explaining Scripture like the Fathers." This turn of phrase suffices at once to show us the vast scope of this rule of thumb regarding the Fathers, which was formulated of old by Saint Leo the Great,[76] solemnly sanctioned by the Council of Trent, and recalled again closer to our own time by papal teaching.[77] It also goes to show what a broad scope of interpretation ought to be allowed in applying the rule. "The senses of Sacred Scripture . . . reach us through the Holy Fathers,"[78] we read. In his Supplement to the *Ecclesiastical History* by Eusebius, Rufinus wrote of Basil and Gregory Nazianzen, who withdrew from the world in order to devote themselves to theological studies together:

> After forswearing all the secular Greek books, the two of them spent thirteen years studying only the volumes of Divine Scripture. In seeking to understand them, they did not base themselves on their own presumptions, but on the writings and authority of their forefathers, who themselves, it is clear, had the touchstone for understanding things of this nature handed down to them through the apostolic succession.[79]

Commenting on the verse, "unless you believe, you will not understand," from Isaiah, John Scotus Erigena saw Peter as a symbol of faith, and John as a symbol of understanding. The two apostles had run together to the tomb of the shroud-wrapped Christ. Peter had entered the tomb first because faith precedes understanding. As for the tomb itself, it was Sacred Scripture: "The tomb of Christ is Divine Scripture, in which the most profound mysteries of his divinity and humanity are protected and veiled by a kind of rock, as it were."[80] This interpretation of matters was destined to remain classic for a long time.[81] With the coming of Abelard in the first half of the twelfth century, it seems that we are forced to acknowledge the rise of an innovator, if not a revolutionary, in terms of both method and ideas. Do we not find that he had the reputation, above all, of being a dialectician? Did he not stand accused of being "a lover of novelties"?[82] Did this "new theologian" not fabricate "new dogmas"? Did he not launch a "new theology"?[83] The work of his that is currently known under the title *An Introduction to Theology*[84] tends now to come across as an introduction to Scripture. Incidentally, its real title is *A Scholastic Summa*,[85] since, for Abelard, "theologia" is rather the study of divinity alone.[86] Through this "summa of sacred learning" Abelard desires to endow the student with "a knowledge of the divine writings."[87] And into this knowledge that he hopes to convey to the student, which is obtained thanks to a threefold exposition of Scripture, he puts all doctrine.[88] As we noticed earlier, nearly the same principle applies to Hugh of Saint Victor, who composed his great treatise, *On the Sacraments of the Christian Faith*,[89] to serve as an introduction to the allegorical study of the Old Testament. When Richard of Saint Victor wrote the words "sacred theology" he was thinking of Scripture quite as much as he was of theology.[90] Like dogma itself, moral theology was the object, even in the twelfth century, of a teaching whose character was essentially biblical, a point that has recently been made by Philippe Delhaye.[91]

It should be noted in passing that it is precisely because these categories of equivalence have not been impressed on the mind that a great many traditional texts in which there is a question of Scripture have sometimes been interpreted in a petty, or at least overly narrow, sense. For the same reason, many have been overly zealous in reproaching our ancient writers with a superficially utilitarian conception of knowledge and culture. In his thesis, *The Teaching of Classical Letters from Ausonius to Alcuin*, Maurice Roger makes Cassiodorus say that "secular knowledge is only useful to the extent that it helps in the comprehension of Scripture," and he summarizes the thought of Alcuin by saying that Christian wisdom attributes

to scientific knowledge "a limited object, which is to arrive at the literal understanding of a fixed, immutable, sacred text." In such a conception of things, he concluded, "the role of letters and liberal arts is singularly restrained and diminished."[92] It is clear that explanations and judgments of this kind are hobbled by an ample measure of both literal exactness and deep-seated misunderstanding. What is more, they played an influential role even among Catholic authors. It is surely and precisely the case that everything was ordered to an understanding of Scripture, in accord with an outlook that was shared by someone like Origen no less than by someone like Saint Augustine. "For just as iron causes gold to take on a brightness and clarity, so do the secular disciplines impart a shining brightness to Sacred Scripture."[93] Although many different nuances and shades of meaning colored it, this was a sort of constant refrain not only at the time of Alcuin, but for quite a long while beyond his era. In terms of the ninth century, let us cite Ermenric of Elwangen:

> The sayings of the pagan poets, as abominable as they are on account of their untruth, are nonetheless useful when it comes to comprehending divine eloquence.[94]

And as far as the twelfth century is concerned, we have Petrus Cellensis saying that:

> In this way grammar, dialectic, geometry, and astronomy are seasoned by the savory salt of Divine Scripture. The taste of these disciplines used to bring death in its train . . . [but] when flour, which signifies grace, was mixed in with them, they began to provide a healthy and refreshing nourishment . . . seeing as people, after they have been thoroughly grounded in secular literature, read divine literature more earnestly and have a keener understanding of it.[95]

It must be realized, however, that this kind of understanding of Scripture, obtained as it was through a twofold literary and academic culture, did not by any means constitute "a limited objective." It was an undefined understanding, precisely because it was an approach to the depths of God.[96] It was not a matter merely of a text being explicated, but of mysteries being explored.[97] The seven streams that flowed forth from the fountainhead of philosophy came to feed "the labyrinthine pathways of Scripture."[98] Each one of the seven liberal arts was merely like a city marking a milestone in the stages of an itinerary that led at long last to

the "true homeland." And this "true homeland" was that understanding of Scripture in which a practical application of the four senses promoted the visible ascendancy of a many-faceted wisdom.[99] And if exegesis was intended to be understood in a more "limited" sense, then it, too, was considered merely one of the milestones on the road to wisdom. This is how things were explained by Rabanus Maurus:

> Everything is to be referred to one end term. By everything I mean anything useful that can be found in the books of the pagans and anything salvific that can be found in Sacred Scripture. The purpose of all this is so that we may reach the perfect knowledge of truth and wisdom and by it discern and hold fast to the highest good.[100]

The state of the arts and sciences at that time was dependent, as always, to be sure, on the general state of civilization. But, as for the role that was attributed to the arts and sciences, it was, for all that, neither "narrowly restrictive" nor weak and attenuated. The end that was assigned to them placed no obstacle, in principle, to their blossoming forth. The frescoes in the refectory at Saint Gall, where the sages of Greece were to be found in parallel with the Christian saints, do not testify to a petty, small-minded conception of the matter. It has been reiterated that the Middle Ages "were not yet cognizant of a disinterested culture."[101] But in a judgment of this kind there is to be found, perhaps, a subtle, hidden equivocation. The affirmation of a superior finality, or, to use a scholastic expression, the subordination of human disciplines to divine wisdom, is not necessarily destructive of all disinterested culture. To think in this way we must have failed somehow to understand what the absolute requirement is in the search for God. On a more elementary level, this means, too, that we must have failed somehow to experience within ourselves any demand for unity in the life of the mind. In reality, this affirmation of a superior finality is only opposed to the feckless gratuitousness of pure curiosity or aestheticism. It runs counter to that caricature of culture "that tries to exalt itself into wisdom"[102] and that is the preoccupation only of mediocre minds or decadent eras. Has any true poet ever wanted "to create a work that is limited to the world of aesthetic values"? Has any true poet ever been able to rest content with "beautiful appearances"?[103] And does not even the first of the great modern humanists echo these medieval thinkers of ours, who have been so vehemently decried, when he asserts that: "The liberal arts are a means, not an end"? "It is folly," Petrarch goes

on to say, "to rest content with these liberal arts, while life presses on us with its many demands, and from one day to the next death is fully capable of supplying its unexpected conclusion to this reasoning process whose premises we are obstinately resolved not to go beyond."[104] Let us, then, join H. Fichtenau in acknowledging that the best minds of the ninth century subordinated everything to the "service of the King of Heaven." But this does not constitute an imperfection on their part. Their actions were "in the spirit of Origen, for they believed, as did he, that profane knowledge was a useful aid to theology."[105] But even so, there are many ways of understanding the usefulness or relationship of means to end. Dom Jean Leclercq could write, without any lapse into contradiction, that the monks of the Middle Ages "sought a usefulness" in their study of the classics and that, all the same, when they did indeed transcribe the texts of these classics, "it was simply because they loved them."[106] For the usefulness that they sought was none other, in the case of writers, than that of literary beauty, and in the case of thinkers, that of the truth that was contained or held captive in the body of thought represented by the classics. Thus beauty and truth were only "useful" on the condition that they were first delighted in and loved for their own sake.

An author like Walafrid Strabo proffered a good demonstration of this love when, in eulogizing a holy priest, he said that he had "a lofty knowledge of literature."[107] At that time, "the benefit of knowledge" was generally held to be an integral part of holiness.[108] We can well believe that in point of fact this "knowledge" or culture was often rudimentary. The cause of this rough state of culture was the "hardness of the times." But such poverty was in any case quite the opposite of a rank prejudice.[109] It has recently been claimed, too, regarding the privileged period of the ninth century, that books were "laboriously" copied only to perform a "work of penance" and that they were "thought of merely as precious vessels."[110] Would to God that we ourselves subscribed to a notion of wisdom that was as precious! Loup de Ferrières wrote to Einhard, saying that: "To me it is quite apparent that wisdom should be sought for its own sake."[111] In so doing, there is no doubt that he gave vent to a sentiment which, in its precise and conscious purity, will never be very common among men. At least, though, this notion did not set him apart from the elite of his time. It cannot have shocked or astonished his correspondent in any way, any more than it did the other representatives of the mentality that held sway at that time. It highlighted what they held as an ideal. Not all of them would have been capable of making such a clear declaration. It is quite natural, moreover, that statesmen like Charlemagne or even Alcuin

should, at the same time, have been concerned about more tangible results. The matter finds its verification in every century and in every society. Rarely, however, does one ascertain such a deep concern for the religious dimension, that is to say, so generous a portion of disinterestedness.[112] Surely, moreover, it is a beautiful sight to behold, when an emperor, curious as he is about all kinds of knowledge, applies himself with conviction to a renewal of learning and studies, "so that those who seek to please God by living right may not neglect to please him by speaking rightly as well!"[113] Here we have the articulation, in quite exact terms, of a notion that will reappear, close to two centuries later, as the ideal of the great Gerbert.[114] Yet again, it is surely beautiful and edifying when we see that, in the monasteries, Charlemagne was praised quite as much for having brought to earth barbarousness of language in books as for having vanquished barbarians on fields of battle![115] Highly significant are Einhard's hyperbolic remarks when he writes that his hero "brought an air of reassurance to the radiant spread of knowledge and transformed the whole extent of the kingdom that he had received from God and that was still wrapped in mist and blindness, so to speak, making it a luminous country, blessed with eyes that were suffused with divine clarity."[116]

What is more, Alcuin himself gives expression to ideas that are the same as those of Loup de Ferrières. All you have to do is open the *Grammatica,* his modest school book, and in its pages cast your eyes on the following passage: "As regards wisdom, you love it for the sake of God, for the sake of purity of soul, for the sake of knowing truth, and even for its own sake."[117] In the epitaph which he composed for himself, he said: "My name was Alcuin and I always loved wisdom."[118] Right to the end he was to show himself faithful to the lessons of his master Aelbert, whose epitaph contained a similar verse: ". . . He was always a great lover of wisdom."[119]

How far removed this is from our rude and clumsy pragmatism! How little it resembles our feverish preoccupation with utility! The Church has never counted as many poets in her ranks as she did in this era of her history. They were to be found among her governing authorities no less than in her monasteries. Surely this is an eloquent witness, one that speaks volumes! It must be said, however, that few of these poets were truly inspired. Even somebody like Theodulph, among the bishops, is certainly not a Prudentius brought back to life. He scarcely even reaches the level of a poet like Fortunatus. All of them simply have too slight a contact with ordinary life, although it must be said that the aristocratic character of their art is not a matter of principle, and their "academicism" is not as universal as has been claimed.[120] The verses of Godescalc, verses "of

flute-like sweetness,"[121] do not qualify as poetry of the heart! Neither do Walafrid Strabo's epic images and amiable descriptions, nor even the heavenly sequences of Notker of Saint Gall. As for the classical erudition of these poet theologians, it is usually denounced as impoverished and secondhand. This is not always true. Doubtless it was the case, during these times, as in other ages, that if a person had access to good school texts, such as the *Institutiones* of Priscian of Caesarea, he was furnished for life with a copious repertoire which contained many passages from Cicero, Sallust, Virgil, Lucan, Terence, and others.[122] But even so, the direct and integral reading of master works was not a rare thing. It is too often forgotten that the only reason a number of classical authors are known to us even in our own day is the care that the Carolingians took to collect and recopy them.

Virgil, in particular, never ceased to fascinate the generations of medieval man. Allusions to the poet are widespread in verse and prose, as are the free-wheeling imitations of his works. This manifest popularity, together with the spirit of fervent appreciation that manages to come to the fore, demonstrates that Virgil's poetry was more than just a simple vehicle for self-expression. He was familiar to the literate people of the time, to theologians and the spiritually minded as well as others. All of them more or less followed the lead of Rufinus. Rufinus put Origen into Latin, even while he summoned up memories of Virgil almost constantly.[123] Gregory of Tours himself, who lived in an age and a milieu that were especially barren and fruitless, and who bewailed his own "rusticity," cited or alluded to Virgil "a great number of times" in all his writings.[124] Saint Cadoc, that warrior monk who came from Wales in the same century as Gregory, "translated Virgil in his moments of leisure."[125] Alcuin transferred the enthusiasm of someone like Benedict Biscop for the literary tradition of Rome to the continent. There he perpetuated the spirit, at once so ecclesiastical and so Virgilian, that informed the likes of Aldhelm of Sherborne, Bede, and Boniface. Alcuin would not, doubtless, as Ennodius once did, have bestowed on Virgil the title of "cornerstone of the ranks of learned doctors."[126] He rejected "Virgil's lies."[127] This was the expression that had become current. It was invoked to draw attention to the poet's pagan foundations and mythology, and became an expression that was destined to be in vogue for a long time: "Virgil's Muse lends color to many lies."[128]

To these "lies" Alcuin opposed "the truth of the gospel."[129] He wanted hearts to be open to the four Gospels rather than to the twelve books of the *Aeneid*. All Christians would be quick to commend him for this line

of thought. He reproaches the bishop Ribod for losing sight of this distinction through his love for Virgil. But from the playful way he does this, it is quite evident that he is a man who understands such a love.[130] The same applies to Paschasius Radbertus, who protests that he does not plan, in his theological work, "to concoct a tale from the vinegar of Virgil."[131] Even so, he does not refrain from citing the *Eclogues*.[132] In truth, doctrine, with its indispensable intransigence, is one thing, while beauty, culture, and human sensibility are another. Someone like Milo of Saint Amand knows how to make a distinction like this, which he expresses on the threshold of a poem that owes much to Virgil.[133] From a voyage to Pamplona Saint Eulogius of Cordoba joyfully brings back a copy of the *Aeneid*, together with the *City of God* and certain other works. He claims to have done so "not for himself alone, but in order to make it possible for all the curious minds in his monastery to profit from these works."[134] Virgil was the object of tender love and affection in the Abbey of Saint Gall,[135] which was, for so long a time, such a marvelous oasis of culture. This was true of many other places as well.[136] His language[137] and his lyricism[138] were the delight of countless people. It has been written that he was "the passion of some and the scandal of others."[139] But the very persons who considered the possible scandal of his work and who took protective measures against his "luxuriant eloquence"[140] themselves experienced this selfsame passion. They felt obliged, in the face of his influence, to protect the Bible's "divine poets"![141] The very fact that there was a recurrence of the belligerent language of mistrust and anathema, for which the Fathers, especially Jerome and Augustine, had provided a literary model, is indicative of a beguiling attraction that was always threatening to encroach into every region of the soul: "seeing that the lofty power of the words themselves insinuates itself with ease into the very sinews of the heart . . . ."[142]

The Carolingian "renaissance" took place, it might be said, under a banner-like motto provided by Virgil:

> "Rome, renewed again in all its golden splendor, takes its rise once more in the world."[143]

This "renaissance" did not last long. But even after the collapse of the empire, the vicissitudes of politics never put a complete damper on the concern for a well-founded education that lay at the heart of the Latin church. The Muses remained in their places of honor. Christianity was busy propagating the spirit that Saint William Firmat later condensed into the following adage: "Leisure without humane letters amounts to death,

the entombment of a living man."[144] There remained a great many who wanted "to study pastoral poetry along with the gospels," even to the point of excess.[145] Moreover, there remained a great many whose ideal it was to unite a "knowledge of secular letters" with a "contempt for the world" and an acceptance of "divine grace."[146] Even good authors in our own day all too easily misconstrue what was merely a warning as a lack of sympathy toward profane culture, indeed, as contempt for all culture. The warning was constantly being reiterated inasmuch as it was always proving to be necessary as a counterpoint to the paganism in which the poets and "the philosophers of this age" had been nourished.[147] Those who were most vigilant in this regard were often themselves the most cultivated of men. It can be said that the theologians who flourished during the Middle Ages generally demonstrated a taste for the classics that differed from the taste that would later characterize the humanism of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Indeed, the classical predilections of the medieval theologians are rightly considered superior, for they are less artificial. They were still guided by the dream of a "Christian Athens" as conceived by Alcuin. Their attempt as Christians at assimilating the classical influences was not meant to be a vain effort at reconstruction.[148] It turned out that their means for the task were not adequate, and so the dream never became a full-fledged reality. But, be that as it may, this remains one of the most beautiful blossomings of vitality that a historian finds it his privilege to observe. The efforts of someone like Saint Thomas Aquinas, who was opposed to the archaeologism of the "Averroists," could be construed as a continuation of this vital current of thought. A later chapter, however, will provide us with an occasion to return to this subject.

3. Queen of the Arts

It turned out that in some periods, and in the works of some writers, "theological science" was in fact reduced to an explication of Scripture that bore a very unscientific character. In other periods, however, the explication of Scripture was elevated, in theory at least, into the realm of "science" through the affirmation of certain principles. This turn of events occurred, most notably, each time it was posited that there was a relationship between a classical division of the sciences and the division of the senses of Scripture. The first of our authors to attest to this enterprise is Saint Eucher, the bishop of Lyons.[1] He was followed by John Scotus

Erigena. The latter may be thought to have complicated this undertaking somewhat by his reliance on a concordance that was established at this same time with the four elements.[2] Christian of Stavelot[3] and Angelome of Luxeuil[4] follow Eucher's principles. But while the schema is the same in the works of Eucher and Christian, it is set out somewhat differently in Angelome and John Scotus. This is a good indication of its artificial character.

The endeavors of Eucher and his imitators were grafted onto a much more ancient tradition, whose history we shall not attempt to rehearse here. Clement of Alexandria[5] and Origen[6] are the first witnesses to it within Christianity. According to this tradition, certain sections, at least, of Scripture were in respective agreement with one of the three great divisions of universal science. This conviction was itself found to be allied with two other more fundamental ideas. One of these tended to make each of the profane or "liberal" disciplines serve to elaborate the "spiritual disciplines,"[7] which is to say, more than anything else, the explication of Scripture. The other idea tended to go further, finding in Scripture the source and summit of all knowledge, profane as well as sacred. On the one hand, Moses was seen, according to Saint Stephen,[8] as having been instructed in his youth in all the wisdom and knowledge of the Egyptians, and ended up being taken as a model by his commentators: "For who could be unaware that in the case of Moses and the prophets certain ideas are taken from the books of the pagans?"[9] For it was repeated axiomatically that "Egypt is the mother of the arts."[10] On the other hand, the knowledge and wisdom of the Greeks was said to possess no authentic value except through its borrowings from the Bible: Plato was the disciple of disciples of Moses, "the first wise man." By a change of vowels, the Greeks, it was said, had changed the name of Moses to Musaeus, so as to make him the master of their Orpheus. In restoring the true vowel sounds, the pious Proba Falconia made Virgil himself set forth a thesis which was for centuries a common point of focus for both Jewish and Christian apologetics:

> Better than anyone Moses seems to have been capable of proclaiming to the whole world all the things which are, which were, and which the future holds.[11]

The first of these two ideas made everything meet in Scripture, in order to unify and sublimate everything in Christ. The second made everything flow from it. It conceived of theology as containing the pre-

liminary principles, at least, of all human knowledge. In terms of the first idea, all knowledge naturally acquired by man was needed in order to explicate Scripture.[12] The seven liberal arts or, as Herrad of Landsberg puts it, "the seven foster-daughters of Athens,"[13] were the seven columns on which divine wisdom itself had to find its support in us. Or they were stairs that had to be scaled in order to reach, at last, "the summit of the Scriptures."[14] In terms of the second idea, however, these liberal arts themselves were in reality fruits of a Scripture that was universally and teemingly abundant: ". . . perennial theology brought forth these seven."[15]

We find one of the most beautiful expressions — and there are many of them — of the first idea in the commentary of John Scotus on the *Celestial Hierarchy:*

> For just as many waters come together and flow down into the bed of one river from different fountainheads, so do the natural and liberal disciplines coalesce to form one, same meaning of inward contemplation, which the highest fountainhead of all wisdom, that is to say Christ, insinuates in every quarter through the different speculations of theology. And perhaps it is this that is said by the psalmist of the blessed man: "He is like a tree planted by streams of water." That is, he is like Christ. All the natural arts, within the confines of which all of divine Scripture is circumscribed, concur with the meaning that Christ holds as a type. For there is no element of Sacred Scripture that lacks the patterns evinced by the liberal disciplines.[16]

As for the second idea, it can be seen affirmed by Christian of Stavelot, for example, who was persuaded that in Sacred Scripture is to be found all that would merit the name of science or philosophy among "worldly sophists."[17] Or it can be seen affirmed by the biographer of Saint Bruno of Segni, who supposes that he cannot deliver a more beautiful eulogy of his wisdom than by saying:

> Saint Bruno clearly understood that Sacred Scripture, besides containing revelation about the divine mysteries and legislative details about them, also contains a storehouse of human knowledge . . . .[18]

Or yet again, this time with an exaggeration that scales the heights of caricature, we have the vindictive and pedantic Gunzo of Navarre, who,

in a pamphlet which he drafted in response to a monk of Saint Gall (965), wanted to subordinate the science of astronomy in its entirety to the biblical account of the stopping of the sun by Joshua.[19]

On both sides of the issue there is the assertion, echoing Sirach,[20] that all wisdom is a gift from God. But this same formula encompasses two opposing ideas. For some this gift is the light of the Word that illuminates all men. For others it is the light that is historically diffused by the Holy Books. Of these two obviously contrasting views, the first proved a stimulant to profane as well as sacred studies. The enigmas of Scripture instigated research. Faith tended toward understanding,[21] and the more it happened that roadblocks, in the form of difficult and troubling questions, were encountered, the more it was necessary, as Abelard supposed, to be open to the whole order of knowledge, with a view to supplying a response and establishing a new synthesis.[22] The greater the desire to advance in "theology," that is to say, in the understanding of Scripture, the more necessary it was, as Peter Lombard put it, to recur to "certain analogies" that were taken from the human sciences such as found in the writings of the Gentiles.[23] The second idea, contrariwise, ran the risk of becoming an excuse for laziness and force of habit, as is seen in this reflection on the part of one of the Ancients relative to astronomy:

> It is enough for us to have as much understanding about this art as can be read in the Scriptures. It is quite unbecoming for us to follow human opinion in this regard, since we know we have as much divine doctrine on the subject as it is useful for us to know.[24]

The first idea should therefore have been a factor in favor of progress; instead, when it was badly understood, it was apt to foster illusions of concordance. The second threatened to impede the soaring flight of scientific knowledge and carried within itself the seeds of serious strife. It was destined to get a fresh lease on life and become hardened in its attitudes in the traditionalism of modern times: "Genesis suffices for a knowledge of how the world began."[25] Nevertheless, there is something artificial in setting up an ideological opposition of this kind. In point of fact, from the very beginning, it was possible to find both these ideas being professed simultaneously. The one was implied in the other, since they were inverse but complementary. For a long time to come, they were destined, for the most part, to remain intermingled with each other. Somebody like Rupert of Deutz, for example, warrants both of them at once, or rather he warrants the one by means of the other, when he writes as follows, after having

demonstrated the necessity of human knowledge as an efficacious defense of Scripture against heresy:

> Therefore the seven liberal arts, like maidservants, have entered into the sacred and venerable dining-room of their mistress, wisdom, and they have been redeployed, as it were, from the lawless crossroads to the strict and severe superintendence of the word of God and they have been bidden to sit down. . . . In what respect do we speak of these liberal arts as having been admitted into this strict school? Rather, it should be said that, since they were not known to have entered it from the outside, they had appeared on the scene from the inside. For those who have examined the Scriptures by way of wisdom are amazed to make the discovery not only that these arts were always there, but also that they were so hidden, so obscured by the light and the majesty of mistress wisdom, that it was not easy to see that they were there. . . . It is for this reason, moreover, that the liberal arts are not very evident when they are there, because Sacred Scripture clearly uses them without explaining how in turn they are to be used. . . .[26]

Even earlier, Cassiodorus,[27] and then the *Libri Carolini*, had proposed a similar analogy:

> Everything that writers on the liberal arts have placed in the precincts of their own gardens can be found to some extent in the exceedingly broad meadows of Sacred Scripture. All these things are to be found, I maintain, by dint of mental application, not in explicit verbal descriptions. They are to be ascertained in the deep roots, not in the falling leaves. For this is how the liberal arts are discerned in the hidden depths of Divine Scripture by anyone who is eager to do so, just as intimations of the wine that grapes yield can be observed on vines, just as crops can be seen in their seeds, leaves in their roots, fruit in its branches, and the greatness of trees in their nuts.[28]

For these writers, in principle, Scripture contained everything. Scripture was first in every respect — in authority, in usefulness, and in antiquity.[29] It was "the fountainhead, as it were, of all erudition."[30] As Saint Jerome had said of the Book of Isaiah only,[31] all that human language could utter, all that human senses could conceive, whether it be "physics" or "ethics" or "logic," everything was encompassed by it. But an affirma-

tion of this kind was not identical to the old thesis of "plagiarism." It did not mean, at least not necessarily, that everything was in the Bible in its particular form, ready-made to be extracted from it materially, so to speak. It did not oblige a person to believe, for example, as certain people did in fact believe,[32] that Apollo was not the inventor of the famous phrase, "Know thyself,"[33] but its thief, having robbed it from the Song of Solomon. On the contrary, the more one sought to express oneself in the manner of Rupert or the *Libri Carolini*, the more one became convinced that all the resources of the humane arts had to be deployed to their maximum extent in order to disengage from Scripture a host of hidden potentialities and in this way to allow it, in the end, to provide its own vehicle of self-expression.

Following a more extrinsic method, others tried to harmonize or unite the two points of view. They showed Abraham teaching the Egyptians astronomy or geometry, which the Egyptians were obliged in their turn to teach to Moses. This thesis had been maintained by the Jews a century before the Christian era. It was still being popularized in the twelfth century by Honorius.[34] Or else the metaphor of the "spoils of the Egyptians" was interpreted as an invitation by God not to take but actually to reclaim the goods that had first belonged to the chosen people. In whatever way it took place, this meeting between two ideas that are apparently so divergent was bound to achieve a union and so to form a complex idea of theology as queen of the sciences. And as such she herself would reign with majesty over the great syntheses that mark the golden age of theology. The origins of this notion were quite ancient, since we find it as early as Clement of Alexandria, who, following Philo in this, believed "that wisdom is the mistress of philosophy, just as philosophy is the mistress of culture in its preliminary stages."[35] And we also have Origen, who wrote, in a letter to his disciple Gregory Thaumaturgus:

> What the Greek philosophers say of geometry, of music, of grammar, of rhetoric, and astronomy, namely, that they are servants of philosophy, we ought to say of philosophy itself with respect to theology.[36]

The metaphor of the "maidservant" can be found in the work of Sidonius Appolinaris.[37] It becomes a frequent motif in the Middle Ages. Thus, in the tenth century, the following contention can be found in Aimon of Auxerre: "Scripture is the mistress of the arts, and the rest of them attend on her as maidservants."[38] The metaphor can be found yet again in the eleventh century in the work of Saint Peter Damian.[39] But in his case "it

is the idea of servitude which prevails by a fair ways over that of utilization."[40] The matter involves putting a maidservant in her place. In the words of Peter, she had been giving herself superior, arrogant airs, and the rule of her mistress needed to be reaffirmed. On the other hand, a short while afterward, we find, in the work of Rupert, that the idea of utilization returns to the foreground, and through this the idea of a promotion, of a kind of ennoblement of maidservants.[41] Around the year 1130, Gerland of Besançon writes as follows in the Prologue to his *Candela:* "Theology is the venerable guide and mistress of all studies."[42] In his *De sacramentis* Hugh of Saint Victor has a whole chapter entitled: "How all the arts are subject to divine wisdom."[43] It is a contrast rather than a bond that Richard establishes between the two wisdoms, symbolized by Rachel and Leah, even though he also makes worldly wisdom the "maidservant" of the wisdom of God, which is her mistress.[44] Peter Cantor has a formula that is at once precise and ambiguous: "The liberal arts are the foundation and substructure, as it were, of theology, and serve continually at its feet."[45] The same ambiguity, or perhaps we should say the same synthetic thought pattern, characterizes the observation of John of Salisbury that "since the Sacred Page encompasses a thorough knowledge of all arts and all dogmas, it holds sway."[46]

Here the mistress has become queen. Alan of Lille gives an allegorically detailed portrait of this queen:

> Behold the girl who lives at the summit of the pole,
> Looking down upon the heavens, assigning lights on high . . .
> A diadem flares forth on her head, which glitters with
> A great brightness of gems and burning gold,
> Sparkling forth and flashing
> Amid a dozen constellations of stones.
> Her right hand bears a book,
> Her left hand carries a royal sceptre,
> And her keen little eye strays frequently to the book. . . .[47]

A compendium from the end of the century, which is close to the thought of Alan, shows theology students making their entry, "over the introductory bridge of the liberal arts, into the imperial palace of the faculty of theology."[48] They would not be found worthy to be presented to the queen if they had not first obtained the consent of the maidservants who keep watch at her door.[49] Around the same time, in a very carefully considered discourse that he pronounces to the general chapter of Citeaux

(ca. 1190), Garnier de Rochefort, the future bishop of Langres, who was at that time abbot of Clairvaux, takes up the theme again in his own manner. He sets about introducing the greatest number of elements that he possibly can and, on top of that, mixes them in with the theme of the threefold sense:

> . . . Moses who is asserted to be the wisest of the Egyptians in every facet of wisdom, is said to have watered the flocks of the seven daughters of the priest of Midian at the well, so that in this way it might be given to be understood that he who is a distinguished preacher of theology imbues lovers of the seven liberal arts with their profound mysteries; and from those arts of philosophy he establishes theological wisdom. For . . . theology surpasses all the arts precisely insofar as all of them attend upon her in each of these matters. For when it comes to that sense which lies in the correspondence of words to things, history is encompassed by theology, and in turn the three sciences of grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric are subservient to history. When it comes, though, to that sense which lies in the correspondence of things to mystical matters, tropology is encompassed by theology. And these two are served devotedly by arithmetic, geometry, music, astronomy, and physics. Whatever, indeed, is taught under the heading of history or allegory or tropology, is taught for the sake of this covenant, which is to say, our restoration.[50]

Generally Garnier's "far-fetched" language comes in for harsh treatment.[51] His thought, at least, is fertile. It shows itself capable of uniting a vigorous enterprise of synthesis to a broad and powerful spirit of receptiveness. This is what appears once again in a sermon on Saint John the Baptist, which is also a kind of programmatic discourse:

> For the liberal arts were discovered precisely so that they might devotedly serve theology. . . . For when are we in greater need of words than when we speak of the Word? When are we in greater need of the embellishment of words than when we speak of the Word, who was beautiful in form before the sons of men? Wherefore . . . when are we in greater need of rational words than when we speak of wisdom? Therefore let grammar serve as a maidservant to words, rhetoric as a maidservant to the embellishment of words, and logic as a maidservant to reason. . . .
>
> . . . And in this regard, like a maidservant of the mistress, Physics devotedly serves Theology.[52]

Leaving quite aside the question of the connections that had traditionally been established between the diverse scientific disciplines and the diverse senses of Scripture, we shall have occasion to examine several similar texts. Let us merely assert, for the moment, that such efforts at correspondence and synthesis characterize both of the medieval "renaissances," that of the ninth century and that of the twelfth. Also, what we have just seen concerning the unity of theological knowledge and Scriptural explication was never more literally and technically true than in these two centuries. This was the case, at first sight, for the cycle of studies which in the main Alcuin initiated and for which Rabanus Maurus, his disciple, "the distinguished monastic scholar,"[53] became the theoretician.[54] And this was even more true of the similar cycle of studies that is communicated to us through the writings of Hugh of Saint Victor.

Already "book learning," "the study of reading," and "studies in sacred reading"[55] recommended by Saint Boniface,[56] Alcuin,[57] or Leidrad,[58] with a view to forming young clerics and "renewing the dignity of the House of God," were fairly different from the pure "divine reading"[59] recommended by someone like Saint Hilary[60] or Saint Jerome,[61] prescribed by the Benedictine rule,[62] and so admirably described by Saint Gregory.[63] Nevertheless, it was still not a question here of a study that was dissociated from concern for the spiritual life. As in the time of the Fathers,[64] everyone was obliged in this case to be attentive to the Word that God addressed to him in Scripture before undertaking, in a second phase of the same exercise, to speak to God in prayer: "because God speaks to man in the sacred books, and man speaks to God in his prayers."[65] Reading that had been meditated on in private or commented on in public prepared the way for a "holocaust of prayer."[66] "Meditation on the divine law" and "knowledge of beatitude" had always to be sought after directly in this way.[67] And it was recognized that, above all, a "pious humility" had to correspond to such fervor of study.[68] "The divine pages,"[69] "the sacred pages,"[70] "the holy pages,"[71] "the ancient pages,"[72] "the pages of the Old Testament,"[73] "the pages of the Holy Scriptures,"[74] "the pages of sacred eloquence,"[75] "the pages of divine letters,"[76] "the pages of the Gospel,"[77] "the pages of both Testaments,"[78] or yet again "the succession of pages"[79] or "the perennial pages,"[80] as they were spoken of in days gone by (often in the plural), were "the well of Jacob, from which one drew water that was then distributed in prayer."[81] Now the "readings" or "public lessons" devoted to an explication of "the divine page,"[82] to use a customary singular, of "the sacred page,"[83] of "the celestial page,"[84] of "the page of the Old and New Testament,"[85] of "the universal page of the

sacred word of God"[86] — these readings, which, such as they are, multiply in the twelfth century, are even more different from a primitive "reading."[87] As a matter of fact, they are another thing entirely. A dissociation has taken place, a situation involving a certain kind of progress. Those who are now called "readers of divinity"[88] or "masters of the divine books"[89] or "doctors of the sacred page,"[90] exercise "a magisterial authority," indeed, "a magisterial authority over divine reading,"[91] which tends to become desacralized. They have become "professors of Sacred Scripture." They are "university men" before their time. The genre that they cultivate can no longer be considered the same as what had once been cultivated by someone like Saint Gregory or what is still cultivated by the imitators of Saint Bernard (for all their innovations and occasional inversions) within their monasteries. The students who crowd around their chairs no longer resemble the monks who come, after their work, to hear the "collatio" of their abbot within a liturgical framework. And even if they do manage to accumulate more scientific knowledge, they are also prone to a greater spirit of disquiet.[92] How many of them seek to be taught only with a view to making a career and have already begun their drive to achieve honors![93] They do not draw on the wisdom and simplicity of life to be found in Scripture, but they are keen on obtaining places of honor and being called "Rabbi."[94] The distance between the two genres can be found signally affirmed in this haughty remark by that great "magister," Robert de Courson (around the year 1205): "Whoever reads Sacred Scripture publicly has laid hold of a way to perfection which is greater than any that comes from Clairvaux."[95] It is the rising tide of "science" in the almost modern sense of the word that pushes aside humble spiritual commentary as belonging to inferior stages of growth. What we have, to use the words of Beryl Smalley, is "scholarship" scornfully rejecting "monastic practice."[96]

The latter was not at a loss to defend itself. It performed this task on its own initiative with great boldness, without always disdaining to embark on a satirical exchange,[97] but nonetheless going beyond it to effect a positive work of edification. The twelfth century bore witness to a struggle that had repercussions on the reciprocal attitude which the two camps had toward the Bible. It finds striking expression in the way that both sides of this issue make use of the same vocabulary. This vocabulary, though, was endowed with diametrically opposed meanings. In this way, two extreme positions are affirmed, and the two conceptions or tendencies mentioned above, which are often intermingled, constituted the intermediate position. Those who are infatuated with profane science to the point

of seeming to submit all of sacred science to its methods, speak constantly of wisdom, philosophy, and erudition. They make a grand display of the books they have studied and the classrooms where the chairs of their masters are to be found. They exalt the liberal arts. Yes, but Christians too, those at any rate who want to be not only Christians but Christians in the very deepest sense, possess all of this in truth. They are not like those "scholars"[98] who "are in the habit of going about and visiting the cities of the world, reduced to a state of raving madness by their copious knowledge of the literary arts."[99] Nonetheless, they do have wisdom, philosophy, and erudition, not of the secular and worldly kind, but of the Christian kind, which is to say, the true kind. They have entered "into the school of the heavenly disciplines."[100] Inasmuch as they are "truly blessed philosophers,"[101] it is their conviction that, in order to investigate the mysteries of this "heavenly philosophy," it is well worth the trouble to renounce "scholarly disciplines."[102] They have made themselves students of that school which Wisdom herself has established in her house.[103] They form the "school of Christ."[104] By "following the naked Christ" they have become adherents of the "true philosophy."[105] If others are puffed up with the title of philosopher and demand a monopoly over it, it does not matter. As for them, they will lay claim to the title of "Philo-Christ" or "Christ-Lover."[106] "In our school," they say, "we philosophize under the magisterial authority of Christ's Apostles."[107] Our classroom is the place where we contemplate the Cross. The chair from which the Supreme Master teaches us is this very Cross. Our textbook is the Crucified One. There are many things to be learned in Paris, Orleans, Bologna, Salerno, and Toledo. But the essential thing, the science of life, is not to be found there, for it is being sought where it cannot be found. Rather, it is to be found in the Book of Life, in the Wisdom of God, in Christ, "in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and science."[108] It is in him that Christians are instructed. It is in his "gymnasium" that they exercise their virtues. For them, the seven arts that are truly liberal, the ones that procure true liberty, are those that the Apostle James enumerates in his Letter: these constitute the seven attributes of heavenly Wisdom.

In a scheme of opposition of this kind, which is parallel to the tension between the military service of Christ and the military service of this world,[109] allowances must be made for rhetoric. Rhetoric is clearly in evidence in certain developments that are quite late, like those elaborated by Adam of Perseigne, who gathers together many scattered features of the question.[110] On the one hand, it can never indeed be forgotten that all human knowledge must in the end serve "divine theology,"[111] or as the

current expression had it, "divinity."[112] On the other hand, there is an equally strong desire not to condemn all profane knowledge; quite often, indeed, we find that there is very little attempt to mask profane knowledge. "He drank equally from the streams of divine and human philosophy"[113]: such praise of one monk by another is common. What is more, this talk of a "Christian philosophy" does no more than systematize a very ancient habit of thought,[114] a specialized way of thinking that has not been established as a universal norm. In the writings of certain monastic figures, as we shall see further on in another chapter, the authority that is claimed is, in general, no longer that of Christ, but the special authority of Saint Benedict: it is the "philosophy of father Benedict."[115] On the other hand, we find that what the Prologue of the Rule of Saint Benedict named "the school of the servants of the Lord"[116] is designated as "the school of Christ."[117] This school is the cloister. Philosophy is "cloistered."[118] It is one of the names of monasticism.[119] Therefore, it is by becoming a monk that one becomes "a disciple of the true philosophy."[120] Writing to Heloise, who had become a cloistered nun and abbess, Peter the Venerable says:

> You have changed your studies of various disciplines for a set of disciplines that are far better, and instead of Logic you have chosen the Gospel, instead of Physics the Apostle, instead of Plato Christ, instead of the academy the cloister. You are now a wholly and truly philosophical woman.[121]

There is no dearth of minds capable of reconciling two opposing points of view. They understand that maintaining the intransigent purity of the faith is neither obscurantist nor intellectually narrow, that this pure faith assimilates and wins over more than it excludes or scorns. The very way in which one of them exclaims, "Christ is the true Plato," bears a certain kinship with biblical allegory, for it seems to demonstrate a willingness to enter into a transpositional mode of thought such as maintains the reality of "Plato" together with the whole order of values that Plato's prestigious name represents: secular philosophy, the liberal arts, profane teaching. Were Cistercian environments, in particular, not among those most open to intellectual renewal throughout the twelfth century? Nevertheless, the fact remains that the polemical sting is not absent from language of this kind and that such language emphasizes a duality of orientation which becomes ever more pronounced.

It is this duality that is focused on the twofold "lectio." While monastic "lectio" tended, and is always inclined to tend, toward meditation

and prayer,[122] "scholastic 'lectio' tends towards the question and the disputation."[123] It tends toward a kind of question which is no longer that "question about the reading" which Candide of Fulda talks about as a prelude to "spiritual conversation."[124] It is directed toward a kind of disputation[125] which, although it is not absolutely new, monopolizes the meaning of this word more and more. What we have here again is a fact of language that can serve as an emblem of the evolution which is in progress.

The word "disputatio" was ambiguous. It was a translation of the Greek "dialogé" or "dialexis,"[126] and the "disputant"[127] was a dialectician. A "true disputant"[128] was a "distinguisher between truth and falsehood."[129] Saint Augustine explains this at length in the first book of his treatise against the Donatist Cresconius.[130] Now all discourse, even interior discourse, includes an element of dialectic. Nevertheless, in the sense that had the most currency at first in Christian language, "disputatio" was closely linked to "lectio divina." It was the "collatio," that spiritual conversation which monks had with each other or that spiritual conference which the abbot had with his monks, the essential foundations of which were Sacred Scripture. This is what we find in the Rule of Saint Pachomius,[131] or in the writings of Saint Ambrose[132] and Saint Jerome.[133] This is what we find, too, in the writings of Saint Augustine, when he describes the existence led by the Egyptian monks, "who live lives immersed in prayer, reading, and disputation."[134] The same situation, more or less, obtains in the sermons of Augustine,[135] to cite him again, and also in the Latin homilies of Origen.[136] This was the "allegorical disputation" or the "tropological disputation" commended by Saint Aldhelm,[137] the "disputation about the reading" mentioned again by a hagiographer of the twelfth century.[138] It was apt to be fixed in writing after the fact, in the form of letters or treatises. Certain letters of Saint Augustine, that "eloquent and most cautious of disputants,"[139] were "disputations."[140] Augustine himself spoke of two of them in the following terms: "they contain many disputes about the sacraments."[141] Similarly termed "disputationes" are the books of Lactantius's *Institutiones divinae*,[142] Saint Gregory's *Moralia*,[143] his *Regula pastoralis*,[144] and the *Praises of the Cross* by Rabanus Maurus.[145] According to Aponius, Plato "always aimed the thrust of his disputations at the mountains," which is to say that his thoughts were constantly raised to God.[146] The word found a special application in the writings of the Fathers when they turned to explaining the Word of God. Gregory of Elvira, for example, speaks of that "distinct kind of disputation"[147] which came to clarify the texts that were enveloped "in

the vesture of allegory."[148] Also, there were those "disputations about allegory" that were referred to by Saint Quodvultdeus.[149] In this case, there were contrasting allusions to the "tortuous disputations"[150] that were attributed to the pen of heretics. Certain minds nourished themselves on this fare, which was "like the husks that are fed to swine."[151] But those who were truly faithful possessed in their faith the principle of discernment which allowed them to reject this adulterated nourishment and to keep the passages that were "disputed in a way that was Catholic."[152] Saint Jerome writes that Origen, in the fourth book of his commentary on the Letter to the Romans, "entered into a magnificent disputation on circumcision"[153]; in his own commentaries, moreover, he describes himself as someone who "engages in disputation about the Scriptures."[154] Similarly, Saint Maximus of Turin says of Saint Cyprian that, in explaining the mystery of the two Testaments, "he enriched Christ's Churches with a wealthy fund of disputation."[155] Certain writers use the verbal form without the complementary substantive: "The Fathers, who are the most faithful when they dispute," says Florus of Lyon.[156] "We aim to follow the opinions of the Fathers when we engage in disputation," says Ambrose Autpert.[157] "Disputatio," however, included a whole gamut of meanings. It could pertain to any kind of intellectual research, anything from that special kind of research which could be termed an inquiry[158] to a reflection undertaken in the sight of God on the profundities of revelation, as in this passage from a sermon by Maximus of Turin: "It is said to Peter, 'Lead on into the depths', that is, into the very depths of the disputes about divine generation."[159] This passage is reproduced with a variant by Heterius and Beatus: "into the depths of disputation and the open seas of the Scriptures."[160] And it is a passage, moreover, which will eventually be echoed by Petrus Cellensis, when he presents his *Liber de panibus* to John of Salisbury.[161] The question is: Who are the intermediaries that Petrus draws on? In this case the disputant was someone who made an investigation.[162] Accordingly, there were numerous literary genres that qualified to be called disputations[163]: expositions, dissertations, meditations, and explications, either calm and dispassionate or intense in kind.[164]

These different meanings, which are closely related to each other, were maintained throughout the course of the Middle Ages. Thus, for the meaning of treatise, commentary, or dissertation, we can turn to the work of Saint Bernard,[165] Adam Scotus,[166] John of Salisbury,[167] and others. When Arnold alludes to the lessons of Manfred of Magdeburg, and says that, when he listened to him "engage in wise disputation,"[168] he admired his genius and felt that there was a friend in the making for him, nothing in

this ever so peaceable situation leads us to think of a dispute.[169] Still other examples analogous to the modern era could be found in the theological literature. However, the "disputatio" which will more and more be the focal point, the one toward which the new "lectio" of the master now tends, is discussion, whether it be oral or written. This kind of meaning had been implied in the title of a work by Cicero, the *Tusculan Disputations*.[170] It was already in existence in the first Latin versions of the Holy Books. The Acts of the Apostles, which uses the word to denote the preaching of Saint Paul or his talks with the faithful,[171] also shows the Pharisees "disputing with Stephen."[172] Origen, as translated by Rufinus, speaks of the "disputatio" that he undertook with a heretic.[173] And in a passage that deals with Daniel, Saint Jerome speaks of "disputing against the philosophers."[174] In the work of Cassiodorus the Latin adverb "disputative" should be translated by "logically." It seems, indeed, that a writing was all the more naturally called a "disputatio" when the dialectical element in it was more apparent. This is why the word was applied most appositely to certain portions of the Letters of Saint Paul, "the apostle given to disputation,"[175] particularly his Letters to the Galatians or Romans.[176] This is why it was also appropriately used of books such as the ones that comprise Origen's *Periarchôn*, those "great books that engage in disputations about mystical matters."[177] In any case, in the medieval vocabulary, the "collatio" of former times, under its other name of "disputatio," becomes a "collocutio," that is to say, a colloquy. It is an investigation undertaken communally as a dialogue, a genre which permits the broaching of theses and the elaboration of definitions, which is Alcuin's intention in his pedagogical writings.[178] It may simply be a friendly conversation, an exchange of ideas from which all who have been involved emerge the wiser.[179] It may also involve the comparison of texts or the clash of opinions, all of which can in the first instance occur within the confines of one's own mind.[180] But more than that, it is debate in the proper sense of the word. It is controversy,[181] a genre to which the Savior himself had need to turn when dealing with the Pharisees, says Bede.[182] It is a genre which the Fathers had often practiced[183] and which, from that time on, has not ceased to part of the arsenal in fighting off the assaults of error.[184] Rupert, for example, speaks of "entering into dispute against perverse dogmas."[185] In that case, it is properly called a "verbal contest"[186] or, in Saint Jerome's words, a "verbally contested dispute."[187] The "extremely passionate disputant" who was addressed by Peter the Venerable in his treatise *Contra Judaeos* is evidently one given to arguing, a polemicist.[188] Yet on the same page the word "disputation" can be seen to be

taken in the sense of dissertation and also discussion. We find this to be so in Julian of Toledo.[189] The same is true in the work of the historian Richer when he speaks of Gerbert.[190] Elsewhere, in terms of a more contrived and artificial genre, we find words like "conflict," "struggle," "trial," and "battle."[191] The Middle Ages offers a great many examples of these in both prose and verse. Finally, in its more specialized meaning, the "disputatio" becomes the thing that we nowadays mean in more precise terms by the word "dispute," that scholarly exercise which puts into practice what Florus of Lyon had termed "the work of syllogistic disputation."[192] It is described in the *Didascalicon* of Hugh of Saint Victor as "keen dialectical disputation, which distinguishes truth from falsehood."[193] From that time on, it is spoken of as "the discipline of disputation" or "the discipline of disputing."[194] Abelard, that eminent disputant, gives a perspicacious description of the advantages and dangers[195] of these "dialectical disputations"[196] or "disputational arguments."[197] This is the exercise that both Godfrey of Saint Victor, who makes no objection to it,[198] and John of Salisbury, who does not value it at all,[199] call "scholastic disputation."[200] It is an exercise that was destined to play an important role in the intellectual formation of clerics and that all students of theology still recognize under this name.[201]

4. New Questions

Until the eleventh century, the schoolmen in the cities remained by and large absorbed by the teaching of the liberal arts. Typically, they were concerned with the preparation of their students for the study of Holy Scripture rather than with direct application of the arts to its study. In the new kind of school that Remi of Auxerre, a master with a great reputation, had opened in Paris at the beginning of the tenth century, it was secular knowledge that he had proposed above all. The situation was similar at Rheims with Hucbald of Saint-Amand and somewhat later the great Gerbert. But here, in the second half of the eleventh century, we have an extraordinary flowering of studies, sacred no less than profane.[1] Beginning in 1045, Lanfranc, who had come from Lombardy to France and who was "distinguished for his learning,"[2] made the Abbey of Bec, according to William of Malmesbury, a "a great and celebrated gymnasium of learning."[3] Theology profited from this. But it would no longer be cultivated only in certain select monasteries. More and more now it came to be cultivated outside of this context, in cathedral or chapter schools, which

had become much more widespread since the year 1000. Certain of these schools, principally those at Laon, Chartres, Rheims, and Tournai were destined to have a far-reaching influence, as they prepared the way for the birth of the universities.[4] In such schools theology was no longer oriented, at least in its immediate focus, toward maintaining the spiritual life. Also it can be seen to take on a more technical aspect, as it makes use of more scholarly procedures, and seeks to embrace a broader horizon. Nevertheless, in spite of the example given by Saint Anselm, an example followed by his disciple Honorius in that little "summa" of his that the *Elucidarium* already constitutes, theology still strays only rarely and timidly from the sacred text. When it does, it does so either to lend itself to the organization of some kind of synthesis or to follow a proper, orderly method and deal separately with a whole series of "disputed questions." From these beginnings, little by little, a well-defined genre would be formed, which would itself be subdivided into several kinds, until their systematic grouping in turn begot the great Summas.[5]

There is no doubt that the biblical commentary, properly speaking, had never been the only literary genre in use. Nor is there any doubt that the genre of detached *Quaestiones* had often been cultivated, by Saint Augustine, for example, and then by Isidore of Seville, Bede, Julian of Toledo, Alcuin, Claudius of Turin, and others.[6] Some of these "questions" have come down to us under the title "sermons."[7] (A stop had never been put to the posing of many questions regarding the sacred text.) That is why the correspondence of Alcuin is full of them.[8] At almost every word, an applied reading evoked the comment: "that begs a question."[9] In every generation, there have always been certain questions that were the order of the day.[10] How many times we find this word recurring in Origen already, even in his homilies![11] *Quaestiones* were looked on very favorably in Alexandrian science. Origen linked the genre to the dialogues of the ancient Greeks, which took place in the course of a banquet or symposium. Such, he added — yoking together the two words which, in their Latin form, will come to the fore again in western theology nearly ten centuries later — were those "disputations"[12] on the nature of love, the most celebrated of which was the *Symposium* of Plato.[13] *Questions at a Banquet*:[14] this was in fact the title of a work by Apuleius and of another work by Plutarch. But what a great number of questions there were in the work of Gregory as well![15]

Only there were also, it was thought, all too many "silly, useless, and empty" questions, questions that engendered quarrels, the "controversies" that the Apostle had urged should be avoided.[16] Such questions — too

subtle, or superfluous, or "almost inextricable"[17] — incited endless complaints. There was heartfelt concern that they were a deviation from true research.[18] But in this regard, success was not always the order of the day.[19] Did not Saint Augustine himself admit to his people one day that he had long avoided a certain question that was deeply serious, but too difficult, each time it was broached? We are talking about Saint Augustine here, the same Augustine of whom Aimon of Auxerre could write that "he excelled all the post-apostolic doctors in his elucidation of questions,"[20] the same Augustine who, to give more life to his preaching, loved to associate his audience with his own research by saying: "we shall question together."[21] Finally, in any case, Saint Augustine saw himself forced that day to consider the question head-on and to treat it in depth.[22] Nevertheless, there were still "mysterious questions" which rose up from the depths of the tempted soul, a true scandal to the faith,[23] and "tumultuous questions" that were a scandal to charity.[24] Many other awkward questions were raised by nonbelievers, by heretics, or by the "foolish wisdom of this world."[25] These were "questions full of scruples, destined to make the weak stumble."[26] They were "undisciplined" questions, as Saint Leo the Great called them, a charge repeated, seven centuries later, by Alexander III.[27] They were "impious questions, raised by the devil,"[28] which an authority solicitous for order and unity of thought grew impatient with, desiring "to obliterate them" rather than answer them. They were "tortuous" questions, inspired by a "sly and crafty philosophy."[29] Such questions were often "interminable,"[30] snares that were sometimes mortal.[31] They were "questions full of belching hot air,"[32] "slippery questions," "insidious little questions."[33] Was not the great failing of Arius, the prince of heretics, precisely his undertaking to question things "which had never before come into question"?[34] All these kinds of "questions" were in reality "contradictions."[35] Yet they were not always avoidable:[36] even when they were "perverse," it was often indispensable to hear them out and to furnish a response to them, in order not to leave the faith without a defense.[37] It was even possible to derive benefit from them, for "a question that has been proffered by an adversary provides an occasion for learning."[38] Some questions were simply "frivolous,"[39] or "superfluous,"[40] or even "vile," unworthy of the attention of the true theologian.[41] Others were raised by "grammarians" who were eager to shine[42] — questions that were entirely profane, that concerned the art of language, without reference to the rule of faith and morals and thus out of place "among the sacraments of the Church."[43] There were, additionally, many insignificant questions that were not examined without some ill humor.[44] A variety of

"little questions"[45] were addressed by friends in their correspondence with one another;[46] sometimes, indeed, these were important enough to warrant long exchanges.[47] Still other questions were admitted to be "great questions,"[48] or as Saint Jerome said somewhat haughtily, "not trifling little questions."[49] These were often "profound,"[50] real in any case, but "very difficult,"[51] sometimes inscrutable. This being so, it was impious, in the opinion of certain timorous minds, at least, to want to persist in resolving them.[52] These were "very secret" questions, said to be more the product of a blameworthy "passion for knowledge"[53] than a praiseworthy zeal for "beneficial studies."[54] A man could only flounder and drown if he pursued these sorts of questions, seeking to know "mysterious words and sayings, which it was not lawful for a man to utter."[55]

On the margins of theological thought, however, every age had included a certain number of minds devoted to the examination of scientific questions. And the more "obscure" these questions were, the more intense became the research into them.[56] Within the sacred studies themselves, there were a number of questions that the studious reader of the Scriptures,[57] animated by a genuine "desire to research into things,"[58] could not avoid asking himself. Certain seekers of this sort were always to be found, except in the most deprived and impoverished of generations. They looked into questions that were "reasonable,"[59] questions that were "not contemptible,"[60] questions that were, indeed, sometimes even to be classed as "desirable,"[61] and which the preacher, in certain cases, taxed his ingenuity to raise before his congregation in order to hold its wide-eyed attention and stimulate its aptness to deepen its appreciation of doctrine.[62] These were serious questions. They were certainly "not light,"[63] and they had a way of thrusting themselves on the mind unsolicited.[64] There was an obligation to respond to them with the same level of seriousness, "so that the truth of the Scriptures might shine forth."[65] In this way many things came into "question."[66] It was quite essential to make the following declaration, and the best minds made it good-naturedly: by meditating on the Holy Books, "man, who cannot be lacking in his desire to learn the truth, is moved by numerous questions."[67] Big or small, these questions were most useful in drawing the intellect from its state of torpor.[68] But they called forth a response which one was rarely fortunate enough to find perfectly adequate.[69] For once the intellect was stimulated, the questions kept covering more extensive ground: "many questions arise from this quarter."[70] A proffered reply, moreover, would cause a new question to be broached,[71] one that was often even more difficult,[72] more urgent, or more profound.[73] The result was that the first question turned out to

have been "made worse."[74] It was necessary, therefore, in the end, to recognize, with Saint Augustine that "more things are sought than found, and of the things that are found, fewer still are confirmed."[75] In heaven itself, where "nothing that must be sought will remain hidden,"[76] one might still perhaps be seeking, even as one enjoyed the vision face to face. . . .[77] It was hard work to unravel "the mystery of a question,"[78] and in so doing there was a progression "from question to question," just as there was from mystery to mystery.[79] This is precisely what the greatest of the "Catholic masters" had always more or less done, since the time of Origen.[80] This was the very movement that defined the Christian intellect for Saint Augustine.[81]

In this great array of questions many were, properly speaking, "ecclesiastical questions."[82] Among these was that series of "little Scriptural questions" to which Saint Jerome proceeded to reply in lengthy letters.[83] Some of these were so pertinent, said Jerome (not without a certain degree of self-flattery), that even in themselves they were exceedingly instructive.[84] Some were rendered in a classical form — including the famous question, dating back to the time of Origen, concerning the witch of Endor and the raising of souls,[85] or that concerning Ezekiel's partridge "which hatches eggs that it has not laid."[86] Another, harking back to the time of Jerome, was "mooted in the disputations of all the churches," a true chronological conundrum on the age of Methuselah and its relationship to the date of the flood.[87] Other questions were more lofty, even"sublime and refined."[88] Such, in spite of their modest appearance, were those "grammatical questions,"[89] the study of which prompted their application to the Trinity.[90] Still other questions were especially rarified, like that concerning how it was that Jonah was able to live in the belly of the whale,[91] or especially consequential,[92] so much so that a person could not hope to deal with them thoroughly without serious preparation.[93] The greatest doctors recognized the difficulty of this enterprise.[94] The examination of such questions was well able to prompt a long parenthesis on the part of a biblical commentator. Thus, for example, in one of the homilies of Saint Gregory on Ezekiel, we have an exposition of this kind on the resurrection of the body, which was precipitated by an objection that seemed, at first glance, to be hollow and ridiculous.[95] Accordingly, these questions could be "weighty."[96] There were even some questions so disturbing that, as has happened in our own time, they risked deterring simple souls from the Bible. One day Heloise acknowledged this to Peter Abelard in the name of a group of her companions.[97] Other questions made for some perplexity, at the very least. When, indeed, they were

finally "cleared up," there was rejoicing.[98] A great number of questions took their rise from the disagreement which appeared to exist within the Scriptures themselves.[99] How many passages there were, it seemed, that were "so different as to be mutually contradictory"![100] This being the case, it became necessary to show that their differences were not irreducibly "discordant," that in reality they were, according to the received formula, "different but not contradictory,"[101] that they had been drafted "with a difference in style, not a difference in faith,"[102] or "in different ways, not with a different Spirit."[103] Thus one was forced constantly "to disentangle the knotty questions of the Old and New Testaments."[104] Such was the origin and ancient power of a considerable number of writings,[105] whose aim it was to highlight the mutual agreement of the four evangelists,[106] the coherence of Pauline thought,[107] or, in a particular way, the concordant harmony of the two Testaments. This whole enterprise was also, by the very fact of its existence, one of the most frequent occasions for theological activity and doctrinal progress. What we had here, in fact, was an inexhaustible stimulant to thought:[108]

> There is no discordant note in the way these matters are worded, but our intellectual enthusiasm for researching them is kindled, just as if they were in fact discordant.[109]

As this stimulus continued to hold sway, a thousand questions were asked anew in a similar way. There were questions about the ancient ecclesiastical writers,[110] and especially about the different interpreters of one and the same text,[111] about the decisions of the popes,[112] about the relationship between faith and reason.[113] Finally, of whatever nature the questions were that were being asked or "mooted,"[114] whatever their "perplexity" or their usefulness,[115] whatever the intellectual orientation of the theologian who encountered them, it had always been necessary to give them a hearing, it had always and ever been necessary to seek out solutions.[116]

In the course of the twelfth century, however, certain new features appear or are adopted. First of all, in this renewal of intellectual activity, "questions" begin to proliferate at an unprecedented rate. We find the following ancient formulas, formulas that have a quite natural ring to them: "there is a question," "it can be questioned," "not without good reason there is a question," "now someone might ask," "it is a customary question," "the question arises," "the question is intellectually striking."[117] But then the questions multiply: "once again there is a question," "at this

point a deeper question arises," "similarly there is another question that arises."[118] Often the questions become imperative, insistent: "the question must be asked," "let us ask the question," "the question remains to be asked," "there is still something that we need to ask," "the question remains nonetheless."[119] The "weight" of some of these questions becomes increasingly palpable.[120] But there is an even greater sea-change to be considered: under the influence of diverse causes that we cannot analyze here, the questions are about to assume a more accentuated mark of scientific curiosity. In part, at least, their nature is about to be transformed. Formerly it was often a matter of "delving into the mystery"[121] and, consequently, of a search conducted in prayer,[122] "by seeking, by asking, by knocking."[123] Meditative reflection was stimulated by these kinds of "delightful questions,"[124] and when one of them showed itself to be "too difficult," the Holy Spirit was invoked.[125] That a complete answer had not been obtained was an outcome that was peacefully accepted, for it was a pleasant enough thing to seek, to knock at the door, and to make the rounds of the secret City.[126] In the final analysis the Bible was less proficient in raising questions than it was in providing answers to the questions of each day,[127] to the questions that arose out of the recesses of the human heart.[128] And all the questions culled from every quarter were recapitulated into a single, ceaselessly posed question, the principle of a constant interior progress, which consisted of "seeking self in God and God in self."[129] Thus the research itself took on a contemplative aspect. Finally, whether it was in order to eliminate their contradictions or to obtain a higher knowledge of them, it was especially important to make a comparison between the different givens of Scripture, the object of the same faith. Arriving at a better discernment of the presence of Christ in this area of inquiry was always at the forefront of everyone's concern:

> . . . so that the aspect of wonder itself gave rise to a great question, and the great question encouraged a zealous and pious mind to delve into the great mystery. And it happened in very truth that the man's mind, while piously probing into the profundities of prophecy, retrieved Christ the Lord from the depths of the Scriptures, just as a man might retrieve a fish from the deep sea.[130]

Such was the spirit of Augustinianism — although it was somewhat constrained for a few centuries on account of the falling standards of culture. This attitude of mind was even more pronounced on the part of those who now dreamed of prolonging this spirit. But then, at the very

moment when this way of thinking was felt to be waxing in strength and was ready to take flight on a fresh new pair of wings, a new current of thought repulsed it. Coming on the scene at this point we have the "modern dialecticians," who all too often "distress the house of God with their counterfeit meanings."[131] Here we have the situation where, on every score and lacking all prudence, "the dialecticians ask questions,"[132] and "find an occasion for questions everywhere."[133]

Now in their research into the "the true science of the Scriptures,"[134] these "dialecticians" set about changing the order of essential factors. For them "the study of the reading" comes decidedly before "humility of heart,"[135] and in their eyes the authority of the sacred text seems to give way to a human system of judgment. They no longer know how to "seek soberly" in a context of admiration and wonderment.[136] Spiritual men were anxious about the situation. Generally speaking, it was not that they were enemies of all dialectic. They were well aware that the Christian intellect had always made use of it. It is an excellent weapon against heresy.[137] But the dialectic of the "innovators" was applied to another kind of problem. It assumed a higher order of importance. It sometimes made claims that bore witness to a veritable "hubris." How could there not have been a reaction?

The most conservative of them tried to nip the evil in the bud. They erected a bulwark against the indiscreet encroachments of new questions. Even if they were not blinded, as some people are apt to be, by an authoritarian "crossness of temper," they were quite disinclined to look at these questions in the light that they might assume for an historian of our own day. A modern-day historian would focus only on their positive significance. That is to say, he would see them as the sign of a new and ardent "eagerness to conduct research in the religious sciences."[138] Those opposed to change could not see these questions as a sign of progress. In their eyes it was, as Claudel would say, nothing more than "an effervescence of malevolent questions."[139] Did not heretics always have recourse to these kinds of "dialectical questions"?[140] In any event, they are an obstacle to contemplation.[141] They endanger, unnecessarily, the simplicity or the firmness of the faith.[142] In their temerity, moreover, what these questions were doing in fact was turning away the intellect from its divine object. They were "new," which for many conservative opponents was offense enough in itself. Such questions were, they claimed, the product of "idle" and undisciplined minds or minds that sought to push themselves forward into the vanguard. When they were not simply ridiculous, they "disturbed," they "perverted," they brought on ruin.[143] They were introduced

into men's minds just like the insidious worms that spoiled the manna.[144] What is more, by the very circumstances of their formulation, they were sacrilegious, for they imposed on theology words, concepts, and arguments that were not fitted to it.[145] They imported into divine science the opinions and methods of the "natural faculties."[146] Similarly, they attacked the omnipotence of God[147] or his all-goodness,[148] and presumed to submit the mystery of God himself or his action in the world to the laws which rule the things of nature. They called upon the mystery "to be reduced, to be dissipated, to be directed, so to speak, into categories that had already been constituted in their entirety."[149] Those who raised these questions had no fear of "applying the norms of reason to faith" and of "making faith a derivative of reason rather than reason a derivative of faith."[150] They "discussed the proofs of faith with their petty little human arguments"[151] and claimed at length "to enclose within the limits of their dialectic the One who puts boundaries on everything."[152] Such was the principal grievance of our spiritual types. It was not always without foundation.[153] The following way of expressing the problem could almost have been borrowed from a modern author, and even this comparison, given the absolute difference of situations, is very much intended, by its nature, to show how serious, complex, and swollen with possible equivocations the problem was: "Nothing is more profound than dogmas. . . . But the source of evil lies precisely" in having conceived the "wish to penetrate into the abyss. . . . In wishing to categorize and submit to a framework of understanding that which belongs to another order of things, one has merely given rise to inconceivable subtleties."[154]

At the time of the first "Renaissance," we find the wise Alcuin, who was open to reflective thought and did not scorn dialectic, that "discipline of disciplines."[155] Nonetheless, Alcuin warned against what struck him as "the contentious questions of scholastics."[156] Florus of Lyon, who was more narrowly traditionalist, was impatient with any question that was raised.[157] Aeneas of Paris complained about the large number of superfluous questions, which tended more, he maintained, to worldly things than spiritual things and which Saint Paul had earlier condemned.[158] Since then, Berenger's adventure had increased the fears. An echo of it was to be found everywhere. The tone of these complaints is sometimes ironic, at other times violent, and yet other times poignant. Spiritual clear-sightedness and pusillanimity, a traditional sense and spiritual laziness, respect for transcendence and a want of intellectual imagination — all of these factors are mingled together in very different proportions. At times, the manner in which they are expressed achieves a classical grandeur; the

circumstances that gave rise to them thus communicate to the Christian consciousness a warning that holds good for all the ages.

But these complaints also carry their fair share of injustice. From that time on, a serious abuse was made of the pejorative word "novelties," as in "audacious novelties," "profane novelties." In these spiritual struggles where there is never a definitive winner, intellectual models clash with one another with a fateful inevitability that would have to be described as deplorable — if, that is, we did not feel that the situation was fruitful.

Obliged as he was to discuss the "dialectical questions" raised by Berenger, Lanfranc solemnly protested that it was not something that he had resolved to do with any eagerness.[159] Othloh of Saint Emmeran, John of Fécamp, and Manegold all raise a protest, each in his own way, against rational intolerance. Peter Damian desires to dispel "the cloud of curiosity" that troubles faith's purity of vision.[160] Odo of Tournai grows impatient with seekers after novelty, who, he claims, have no other end in view than to fashion for themselves a reputation as wise men.[161] Assuming a somewhat lofty tone, Rupert declares: "It is not the mark of a good and well-ordered mind to raise and discuss questions of this kind."[162] He compares the person who conducts his research "with friendly and careful attention, not in a spirit of contentiousness, but so as to merit learning in some small way about the truth of divine judgment" to the person who "multiplies questions more out of a desire to be contentious than a desire to learn"[163] or the person who "dogmatizes now with a new-found, ill-considered novelty."[164] Saint Bernard is uneasy about questions that are raised out of season, at the wrong time. They engender a disorderly muddle that confuses the realm of opinion with the realm of faith and attributes to opinion the fixity of faith and to faith the instability of opinion.[165] Questions like these storm their way, so to speak, into Sacred Scripture "without the key which is Christ" and draw profane, new dogmas from it.[166] In regard to Abelard and Gilbert de la Porée, Bernard threw himself into the battle so impetuously that even admirers like Otto of Freising and John of Salisbury could not do other than decide against him.[167] As Bernard's friend, William of Saint Thierry was alarmed by the problems that had been broached by Abelard and by the spirit of intemperate research that he had brought to the study of them. Thus William vehemently denounced the "pointed and scandal-filled questions" of this "dialectical man."[168] Being as he was very aware himself of the "annoying questions" with which the Letter to the Romans abounds, he strove to "suppress" them somewhat too readily at times.[169] The author of the *Disputatio altera adversus Abaelardum*,[170] who is even more vehement,

would like to dam up this torrential spate of questions, which are so "tempestuous," so "perilous," and which run the risk of leading to shipwreck.[171] But the torrent is not anywhere near drying up. Even though Gerhoh, rough polemicist and all too morose reformer that he was, championed moderate opinions and dreamed of universal harmony, he scoffed at the new masters, who were "drunk with wine that is scholastic rather than theological."[172] He drafted a *Book on the Novelties of This Age*[173] that was directed at Peter Lombard and Gilbert de la Porrée, "whose approach to doctrine is not a shiningly conspicuous reflection of the Church." While he does not reject all use of reason in matters of faith, it is his wish, at least, that the "fatuous self-conceit" of certain minds, seduced by the wisdom of this world, should not always be placing in question what had been regulated by Catholic doctors. In a letter addressed to the Sacred College, he broaches this subject and exclaims that "the ancient serpent does not rest."[174] He recalls, moreover, that at Sens, in 1164, the Pope prohibited "undisciplined questions in theology."[175] In order to dispose of them more conveniently Philip of Harvengt strives in vain to minimize the seriousness of these questions whose tentacles have come to exert their grip over the mind.[176] Such questions, he claims, have been spread far and wide by all kinds of insidious books.[177] Gautier of Saint Victor, with his headstrong traditionalism, can overcome them only by resorting to purple prose.[178] Petrus Cellensis, who is more irenical, more reflective, more welcoming, dreams nonetheless of a blessed School of Christ where all questions find their complete elucidation, without a shadow of controversy,[179] Judicious but timid, he dreads questions "which are not going to build up the faith, but are rather going to raise quarrels and indeed ruin those who hear them."[180] He fears that the *Aristotelis silva*, which has become invasive, may end up covering the altar of the Lord.[181] While Aelred of Rievaulx is no more eager to get involved in controversy, he does effect a kind of withdrawal analogous to the one which will later be effected by the author of the *Imitation.* Addressing himself to his disciple, he tells him with melancholy satisfaction: "My son, you are not looking for questions, but for devotion."[182] Peter Lombard himself recalls the evangelists, who set at ease minds that were troubled in their weakness by the "perplexed questions of heretics."[183]

Around the end of the century Peter Cantor, in spite of all his prestige — we are told that he was the most listened to master of his time — ended up being overcome in the struggle that he waged against the "foolhardiness of questions."[184] A solid moralist and good psychologist, but as a thinker somewhat deficient in spiritual vigor, he could not, in the end,

overcome the "modern theologians" whom he accuses of wanting to spread snares for others rather than seeking to discern truth for themselves. He even accuses them of wanting to pluck the fruits of the "sacred page"[185] by an utterly profane effort, as if this were a matter of some sort of liberal or "mechanical" art.[186] He scoffs in vain at their "cunning tricks and idle questions," their "finely worked out little questions," and their "useless, unnecessary questions."[187] In a spirit of eloquent entreaty, he exclaims, thus, to no avail:

> Let us therefore lay aside useless little questions. In that way, we, like the Jewish people, may no longer find ourselves going in useless circles around Mount Seir, unable, by our long wandering in Raamses, to reach the promised land, that is to say, the truth of theology.[188]

His contemporaries turned out to have an ever stronger preference for this dialectical journeying around Sinai, these winding ways in the desert of Raamses, toward that which, indeed, no longer appeared to them to be a promised land or a sacred summit. Taking the offensive once again, the men of science, the seeking minds, the lovers of "questions" gave short shrift to those lazy souls who, "in order to hold everyone in thrall to their own ignorance, do not want them to inquire into anything, but rather want us to be as credulous as peasants and not seek a reason for things."[189] They poked fun at those monks who, by way of "liberal science," wanted to know only their psalter.[190] In theology itself, they turned to bullying these "incompetents," who, because they did not know how to render an account of their faith, as Saint Peter requests, claimed that it was wrong to expound on it and flattered their incapacity by having recourse to the poorly understood words of Saint Gregory: "The kind of faith for which human reason provides proof has no merit."[191]

5. Theology of the Four Senses

In reality neither habit nor idleness was characteristic of the first of these camps, nor was sacrilege or heresy an earmark of the other. It would be similarly simplistic to reduce their opposition to that between tradition and progress. It would also be false to characterize it as an opposition between authority and reason.[1] We do not have backward "fideists" on the one hand and proponents of the "human right to free thought" on the other. What will later be called fideism does not exist, any more than that

which will later be named free thought. "What is at stake is not the authority of the Bible," but only the way it should be interpreted[2] — although it is no more appropriate, I believe, to reduce the whole conflict to a contest between "two interpretations of Scripture: the allegorical interpretation and the dialectical interpretation." What is more, there is actually an exchange of views between one camp and the other. On the one hand, "dialectic, the science of proper disputation,"[3] is not seriously rejected by anyone. On the other hand, the most intrepid reformers, the ones most sensitive to newly arisen necessities, and the deepest thinkers, to boot, are not always the least severe in denouncing certain dialectical "questions" and criticizing those who introduce a surplus of natural curiosity into theology. Nobody, for example, is more forceful than Saint Anselm in castigating the deviations of the "modern dialecticians," their "abominable foolhardiness" and their "foolish arrogance."[4] They dare, he says indignantly, "to make their way on soaring wings of flight towards the loftiest questions about faith."[5] One of his disciples, Honorius, sees in "secular philosophy" and in "dialectic" a wine "that puffs up men's minds and reduces them to being braggarts."[6] Finally — and it is this area that is of special interest to us — foolhardy or not, new or traditional, the "questions" which multiply and which cannot be repressed do not yet constitute, in the twelfth century, the well-defined, technical genre whose origins and history Father Chenu has related.

In other words, theology is not yet, from a methodological point of view, clearly separated from exegesis. "The biblical texts remain the immediate matter of the theologian."[7] Furthermore, as in the time of the Fathers, and as in the time of Bede or Braulio of Saragossa, the questions still remain "Scriptural questions."[8] They are "questions about sacred letters,"[9] or as they began to be called at the time of Anselm, "questions of the sacred page"[10] and "questions about the sacred page."[11] They concern, moreover, "everything on the sacred page that is open to dispute," and only occasionally do they organize these things "serially," putting them "in order."[12] Roughly three categories of these questions can be distinguished. Often they simply constitute, as in previous centuries, treatises that have been introduced into the body of a coherent commentary. We see this in the case of Manegold, in the work of somebody like Rupert,[13] in Zachary of Besançon, in a figure like Gilbert the Universal, or in similarly developed commentaries on the Canticle, which are veritable treatises "on charity."[14] Or we find, as was also true in former times, for example, in the case of Saint Augustine's *De Trinitate*, that they are distinct works of biblical theology, such as those of Richard of Saint Victor or Petrus

Cellensis. Finally, when the questions are "cast serially," they form collections that are analogous, in appearance at least, to both the old-time patristic anthologies such as the *Sentences*[15] of Isidore of Seville or of Tajón of Saragossa and also the old-time groupings of "questions,"[16] a sort of prototype of which can be construed from the "Scriptural questions"[17] that make up the *Philokalia*.[18] It is only the logical order of the anthologies that is joined to the biblical character of the groupings of "questions." Of this type are those *Sentences on the Divine Page*[19] drafted by a disciple of Anselm of Laon, the *Sentences* of Roland Bandinelli (1150) or those of Peter Lombard (1155-7), or again those of Peter's pupil, Peter of Poitiers. These already had a pronounced technical look about them. We have, likewise, the *Sentences on the Sacred Page*[20] by Simon of Tournai (†1201). In this work the biblical texts are coupled with the "sentences" of those who have commented on them, whether they be "Holy Fathers" or "modern masters." In this case, moreover, the thought is organized dialectically. Here we no longer have the model still in evidence in the eleventh century, a model represented by the *Sentences* of Bruno of Segni, which remained close to the *Formulae* of Eucher or the *Clavis* of Pseudo-Meliton. There is nonetheless a continuity between the Sentences of Isidore and those of Lombard.[21]

Writings such as Rupert's *De voluntate Dei* or *De omnipotentia Dei* fall into the second of these three categories. They are essentially biblical studies. This is what they are even in a strict sense. Rupert has no more desire to deviate from the concepts of the Bible than from its texts — and it is this that makes him the object of mocking reproach on the part of certain champions of the dialectical school, disciples of Anselm of Laon and of William of Champeaux, whom he had himself treated harshly: "Sneeringly they said that I was a latecomer to the study of dialectical art."[22] But what is important for us here is that these latter figures themselves still adhered quite closely to Scripture most of the time. Even as great a professor as Anselm of Laon, formed as he was at the school of Bec, called by his numerous pupils "the doctor of doctors," and considered by historians to be one of the principal founders of scholasticism, performed "only one office in all his teaching: namely, commenting on the Bible."[23] In his epitaph, composed by Marbodius, two verses summarize his whole theological output. They are suffused with the notion of Scripture:

> As for the law, the Gospel, and the psalms, if they be wrapped in a cloud of darkness,
> God has granted that they be laid open by the mediation of Anselm.[24]

More philosophical and more cultured than Anselm of Laon, Peter Abelard gives us nearly the same scenario. Not only does this "shining knight of dialectic," who says of himself that he "preferred the armor of dialectical reason,"[25] not miss the opportunity, in his turn, to scoff at "the arrogance" of so many "impudent" dialecticians, "unbridled, untamed peddlers."[26] But what did he himself do, this "innovator," this man "who scandalized the Church with the profane novelty of his words and ideas,"[27] who had come at length to receive instruction "about divinity"[28] precisely at Laon close by Anselm, when he wanted to show, following on the heels of a kind of wager, that he was henceforth capable of teaching theology? He busied himself explaining the prophet Ezekiel. This unforeseen rivalry, he tells us, elicited the master's rage. Obliged to leave Laon, Abelard went to Paris and continued, with great success, his lessons in exegesis.[29] In the account of his "misfortunes," he goes on to say, with a certain pride, that: "As far as Divine Scripture is concerned, the Lord seemed to confer no less grace on me than in regard to secular matters. . . ."[30] He calls professors of theology "masters of the divine books,"[31] and he goes so far as to proclaim, even in his *Theologia christiana*, that Scripture, as explained in its threefold sense, is entirely sufficient:

> Indeed, an understanding of Scripture bears such an abundant wealth of every kind of nourishment and delight that it alone is possessed of perfection of doctrine in its threefold exposition.[32]

This very biblical character of theology was made manifest in a particular way at the Abbey of Saint Victor in Paris.The abbey had been founded by William of Champeaux,[33] who, though opposed to Rupert of Deutz, had been Saint Bernard's protector and who remained his friend. Saint Victor was not, properly speaking, a monastic school, but a school of regular canons, open to secular students. The *Didascalicon* was, as it were, its manifesto and its program. In it Hugh wanted to give a version, of sorts, of Saint Augustine's *De doctrina christiana* and Rabanus Maurus's *Clericalis institutio*, a version adapted to its century. As is well known, the *De doctrina christiana* contains as its fourth and last book a small treatise on preaching. In it Augustine gives Saint Paul as a model, together with Saint Cyprian and Saint Ambrose.[34] Similarly, the *Clericalis institutio* closes off with a treatise on preaching in twelve chapters: after finding out for oneself what is to be learned from Scripture, one must indeed pass on to others what one has come to learn.[35] The program conceived by Hugh proceeds, as we saw above, from the same spirit. His example inspired a whole line of masters,

among whom may be counted, albeit in a quite incomplete way, Peter Comestor and Peter Cantor, who applied themselves by preference to the moral sense, the foundation of "subcelestial theology."[36] This program and its spirit can be found more directly in Godfrey's *Fons philosophiae*, in which "it is remarkable that the author makes no allusion to the *Sententiae* or the *Quaestiones*, the first attempts at a systematization. For him, rather, sacred doctrine remains integrally the 'Sacra pagina', a study of the Bible and of the principal doctors of the Church."[37] We find it naturally in the work of Richard, prior of Saint Victor, who enumerates the four senses once more, as he paints a portrait of the accomplished theologian:

> If we were to see a man who was so learned in secular science, so very expert in the wisdom of divine Scripture, so learned, that is to say, in the Old and New Testaments, in history, allegory, tropology, and anagogy, and learned in terms of threefold discourse, just like Jerome, eloquent in his reasoning like Augustine, like Gregory in terms of morality, and finally as wise as Solomon: we would proclaim with all our strength that a person like this is a great man.[38]

This program can be found, in part at least, even in the literature called *Distinctiones*, which was already quite scholastic, composed of certain kinds of dictionaries or cribs for the use of students or preachers, in which the four senses are carefully distinguished.[39] It can be found even more aptly, in a more complete form, and stemming from a more generous imagination, in the work of someone like Garnier of Rochefort.

Soon, however, studies began being centralized at the University of Paris, which was coming into being little by little.[40] There, theology was to be dominant. Paris, the center of France, which was then "the gentlest and most gracious of nations,"[41] was a veritable "paradise" for keen minds.[42] Paris was "Jacob's ladder, the top of which touched the heavens."[43] From the end of the twelfth century on, famous masters gravitated to this city. The numerous schools that were founded there did not all end up being equally solicitous for the "moral sense" and for the spiritual life. Nevertheless their method of teaching, in its schematic outline, was to prove to be for some time yet the method of the past, the one that had been systematized by Hugh of Saint Victor. Witness the terms according to which Hugh the Primate says theology is taught at Paris:

> Here there is no reading of the poets,
> But rather John and the prophets. . . .[44]

Or the analogous terms used by Alexander Neckam, when he also describes studies at Paris in the *De laudibus divinae sapientiae:*

> Here the arts blossom, the celestial page rules supreme,
> The laws stand firm, rightful authority shines bright, medicine thrives.[45]

Witness as well the Bull that was soon to be addressed by Innocent III to the "masters of Holy Scripture" and to the masters of "decrees" and the "liberal arts."[46] Or, on a more immediate level, witness the enthusiastic praise that the poet Guy of Bazoches gives to this Parisian approach to teaching around the year 1180. Guy starts by celebrating the profane disciplines:

> In this island the sisters, that is to say, the liberal arts, have stipulated an eternal abode for themselves, and as the clarion call of a more noble eloquence thunders forth, decrees and laws are read.[47]

Guy then goes on to draw his inspiration from an image that was classic at that time, the image of the wellspring of knowledge, whose waters fan forth in their several streams as in an earthly paradise. It is this very image that is developed allegorically throughout Godfrey of Saint Victor's *Fons philosophiae* and that was to be taken up again in the following century in an official letter of the university.[48] Using this image, Guy characterizes the sacred sciences in the following terms:

> This fountain of saving doctrine gushes out abundantly, and it brings forth three crystal-clear streams, as it were, in order to irrigate the fields of our minds. It divides the spiritual understanding of the sacred page into three parts, rendering it historically, allegorically, and morally.[49]

There is, to be sure, some confusion in this somewhat overly poetical account.[50] Either that, or history is counted as one of the three branches of spiritual understanding. Guy of Bazoches was not a professional. Nevertheless, his witness should not be rejected out of hand, and even his clumsiness, which is excusable in a secular outsider, seems indeed to indicate that he is not speaking solely in accordance with a traditional scheme of things that no longer bears any correspondence to reality.

Some ten or fifteen years later, Stephen of Tournai (†1203), who had

studied theology at Chartres and who was the abbot of Saint Genevieve, condemns the "noisy din of words and the winding, disputational digressions"[51] with which the Parisian schools reverberated. The atmosphere there is very different from what is to be found inside cloisters, where virtue and truth are cultivated together, where the discipline of regular observance accompanies the study of Holy Scripture.[52] Another time Stephen complains vigorously to the Pope about what he considers to be the decadence of sacred studies: everything is discussed, the mysteries are profaned, the desire to hold fast to the writings of the Fathers in the explication of Scripture no longer obtains, students applaud the novelties of their masters, and these masters, moreover, who are more anxious about their own glory than the doctrine that is to be passed on, "indiscriminately put together brand new little summas and corroborative theological commentaries."[53] Such complaints resemble those voiced in previous generations. Gerhoh, for example, complains of "besotted, drunken readers, who have imbibed too much of the wine of scholasticism rather than the wine of theology," and who are so obstinate at times in their new attitude that they refuse to yield to the testimony of the holy Fathers.[54] These complaints coincide with those that Gregory IX was to direct, on 7 July 1228, at the Parisian masters of theology, those misguided theologians who are no longer "theodidacts" and whom it would be better, the Pope says, to call "theophants."[55] These complaints, moreover, are similar to those Roger Bacon, that gloomy and fretful mind, was to give vent to somewhat later still, in a famous text:

> Although the principal preoccupation of theologians in their studies ought to have been a concern with their own text, it should be acknowledged . . . that for fifty years they have been mainly occupied with questions. This has been made plain and evident to everybody through their tracts and summas and the huge, ponderous works written by many of them, although it must be said that these do not deal with God's most sacred text. For this reason, it is clear that theologians are more inclined to deal with questions rather than the text.[56]

At Paris and at Bologna, Bacon affirms again, the reader of the Bible is given a humble role at the feet of the reader of "Sentences." He is not given the right "to dispute." For his course of studies, he is obliged to beg for an hour that has been left free and unaccounted for, and the sacred text disappears in the face of magisterial "summas."[57] In the middle of

the thirteenth century, the leap is thus made. The break has taken place. "Dialectic" and its "questions" have won the day, and the change in methodology is found to have been accelerated by the inroads of an entirely new set of contents, that of the philosophy of Aristotle.[58] Teaching no longer has as its framework the triple or quadruple explication of the biblical text. References to this framework sometimes amount to little more than vestiges. It is not, however, completely lost. For some theologians yet, it remains a reality. This is demonstrated to us by a rather beautiful text published by Dom Jean Leclercq and dated by him to this mid-century mark:

> Sacred science can be divided into three component parts. These consist of matter or subject, the number of senses, and the differentiation of parts or books. And when it comes to a fourfold division, it is divided in terms of any given one of these three. For it is "a stream which issues forth from a pleasant spot and which is then divided into four fountainheads." For when it comes to divine eloquence, we find a set of four wheels, according to a fourfold differentiation of senses, since, as the first Gloss on Genesis says: There are four rules or senses of Sacred Scripture, that is to say, history, allegory, tropology, and anagogy. . . . All of divine Scripture turns on these four wheels.[59]

If, in this passage, "sacred science" needs to be understood in a broader sense than the Bible itself, reflections of this kind amounted to scarcely more than a memory. Nevertheless, provided that matters are understood somewhat flexibly, provided, too, that there is more interest in basic foundations than in details of method and presentation, what was true of the twelfth century is still true, to a great extent, in the thirteenth. In spite of the complaints of Stephen of Tournai, of Gregory IX, and of Roger Bacon, "sacred science" or "sacred doctrine"[60] remained more or less in point of fact, as it was in point of rightful claim, closely linked with "the contents of the sacred page" or "the contents of the theological page."[61] So it remained, even after the advent of the Questions, even after the victory of the Summas. The distance necessitated by the progress that had been made in the use of certain techniques does not in itself represent an infidelity. An anonymous preacher of this time speaks of theological problems as questions that have been raised "by doctors of Sacred Scripture."[62] Around the same time, in 1250, Robert of Sorbon pictures Paradise to himself as a place in which there will no longer be distinctions to be

made between the learned and the ignorant and between masters and pupils. But, he says, "everyone there will be a master of theology and a reader of the great bible, namely, the divine book of life."[63] Could theology as a discipline and as human research ever forget that it takes its name of "theologia" from its being God's Word about himself?

On the other hand, if the method of the "fourfold sense," considered in the strict meaning of the term, had only an ephemeral ascendancy in theology, the doctrine of the "fourfold sense," which had, from the dawn of the Middle Ages, been at the heart of exegesis, kept this role right to the end. But, it must be conceded, after having been right at the center of things in the realms of both thought and Christian life, this doctrine, once its strength had been sapped, survived too long outside the pale of living exegesis, not to mention living theology and spirituality. For this reason, it ended up losing its connection with these areas, even in cases where it was still, practically speaking, a going concern. No longer the place where these vital elements met, or rather, the place where they achieved union, it became no more than a lifeless shell. That is why, perhaps, it suffered judgments such as those that we broached in our introduction. A new effort, therefore, to grasp its authentic significance and, as much as possible, to express its deep purpose cannot be superfluous.

> The role of the historian is not to set the objective norms of exegesis . . . it is first and foremost to ascertain the past, and then to understand why the past was what the texts tell us that it was.[64]

In order to have the chance to achieve this end and not to close himself in advance to the object of his research, the historian ought also to recall that if the course of time, which changes everything, brings about some kind of progress, this progress is never absolute when it comes to human affairs. In any case, it should be his "triumph," or at least, his desire and his disposition, "to unite objective observation of ancient processes, which are perhaps out of date, but not bereft of lessons, with a sincere approval of legitimate evolutions in methodology."[65]

CHAPTER TWO

The Opposing Lists

1. "Marvelous Depths"[1]

Scripture is like the world: "undecipherable in its fullness and in the multiplicity of its meanings."[2] A deep forest, with innumerable branches,[3] "an infinite forest of meanings":[4] the more involved one gets in it, the more one discovers that it is impossible to explore it right to the end.[5] It is a table arranged by Wisdom, laden with food, where the unfathomable divinity of the Savior is itself offered as nourishment to all.[6] Treasure of the Holy Spirit, whose riches are as infinite as himself.[7] True labyrinth.[8] Deep heavens, unfathomable abyss.[9] Vast sea,[10], where there is endless voyaging "with all sails set."[11] Ocean of mystery.[12] Or raging torrent, if we follow the beautiful image developed by Gilbert of Stanford:

> Like a raging, swift-flowing torrent, Sacred Scripture so fills the depths of human understanding that it is always overflowing its banks. It satisfies those who drink from it, and yet it remains unexhausted. From Scripture there flow forth abundant channels of spiritual meaning, and when some meanings pass away, others arise. No, it cannot be that these meanings pass away, since wisdom is immortal. But what happens rather is that when some have emerged to show their beauty, there are others which take their place. This is not to say that the meanings that pass away are wanting. Rather they remain in evidence and follow close behind in a supportive role. This is so that each and every person might, according to his capacity, obtain in Sacred Scripture the means to refresh himself abundantly and so

that he might in turn pass on to others the means of undertaking a regime of rigorous training . . . .[13]

The more simple and easy this Scripture appears in the way it is worded, the more profound and majestic are its meanings.[14] For this reason, its ability to incite us to do research will never be exhausted. It will always have new mysteries to teach us, and the grandeur of these mysteries will always exceed us.[15] This is the way with anything that is divine.[16] This is the way, in particular, with the secrets of God's Wisdom.[17] Even more so is this the way with the goodness of God, which is the last word of all biblical revelation, a goodness whose benefits always outstrip its promise.[18] What we have here is more than an analogy, since what lies hidden by the letter of the Holy Books is always, in the final analysis, this incomprehensible goodness. Let us then seek, let us explore, let us dig deep: but let us not entertain the hope of exhausting the depths of Scripture. We cannot ever hope to come to the end of the investigations that Scripture demands.[19] Without a doubt Scripture has been expressly written for us, but it does not follow that we can understand it in its entirety in our present condition.[20] Above the intelligible heavens that it unfurls before our eyes, it contains a region that is hidden in the upper waters. The Spirit himself does not reveal the secret of this region to anyone except the angels.[21] "Who is so capable of embracing the Spirit of God that he could shed light on these sacramental mysteries?"[22] Like a casket, too, that is filled with the most precious of jewels, which can only be admired when we feel the weight of the casket, many a sentence of Scripture is full of deep mystical meaning that is not yet accessible to the inward eye of our minds.[23] The least of the stories that can be found recounted in it "is enlarged by the immeasurable vastness of its mysteries."[24] Let us recognize our congenital blindness, seeing that we are faced by something that remains sealed to us. Let us derive profit from our lack of light in order to grow in humility.[25] Let us not, though, seize on it as an occasion for idle laziness. The sacred text spurs us on to make a continual effort at reaching a higher understanding.[26]

In the ninth century these views were contemplated by that deep thinker John Scotus Erigena. He knew that the Eternal Light illumines us by both Scripture and creation at once.[27] Both of these elements are equally both sacrament and symbol for us. Both of them have one literal facade, a visible and sensible aspect, that we must work hard at coming to know, but which we must also get beyond in order to attain, as far as we can, the *spirit* of the one and the *rationality* of the other. Starting with the "simplicity of the letter and of visible creation," we ought therefore to

allow ourselves to be led, by degrees, "right to the summit of contemplation."[28] For "the surface of the Scriptures" and "the sensible forms of the world" are the two garments of Christ.[29] They are like two veils, which filter the overwhelmingly brilliant light of divinity for us, or, to use another image, they conceal from our eyes the feet of the Word.[30] But they are at the same time signs, images, which allow us to catch a glimpse, through the "reason" or the "spirit" that they contain, of the beauty of Truth itself.[31] Without sin, the symbol of the world, in its unspoiled transparency, would have sufficed. Now, to decipher it, we need the the help of Scripture.[32]

John Scotus, influenced by Pseudo-Dionysius, considered the area of Scripture in its origins and in its end term, in the first, fresh simplicity of its beaming divine radiance and in the rediscovered unity of all things in it. What is simpler than the Word, what is more one than what he gathers together for eternity?[33] But in coming to us simplicity is fragmented, or, rather, simplicity becomes fecund and fruitful, it opens itself up to the multiplicity that it engenders, so as to gather it up at a later stage and contain it in its bosom: "in that whole notion of simplicity, however, there are to be found many facets of speculative thought."[34] This whole intermediate area, comprised as it is of multiple sacraments that are united in the sacramental mystery of the flesh of Christ, is given to us, during our terrestrial existence, for our varied and many-sided contemplation.[35] Thus, without losing the primordial unity that it possesses in the Word, Scripture does not discourage our making use of a whole gamut of senses, which are as numerous as the many colors of a peacock's tail.[36] This is an image that John Scotus could have received from Cassiodorus, who made a special application of it to the Psalter.[37] To speak in more correct terms, the interpretation of Scripture is indefinite, being as it is in the image of the infinity of its Author.[38] It is like a great poem, with a pedagogical intent, whose inexhaustible significance leads us to the pure heights of the summit of contemplation.[39]

Such insights permit John Scotus, drawing on the same "piety," to welcome the diverse explications proposed by the Fathers of the Church on the same text, although he does not exhibit any disinclination to communicate his own preferences.[40] The work of the Fathers emphasizes the fecundity of Scripture, that fecundity which, according to Saint Bernard (who follows in the footsteps of Origen),[41] Saint Augustine,[42] Saint Hilary,[43] and many others,[44] engenders "diverse ways of understanding that are accommodated to the diverse dispositions and necessities of souls."[45] Others will add to this idea by talking of diverse ways of understanding that are accommodated to the diverse necessities of the times.[46]

"Scripture abounds in secret and very sacred meanings."[47] Although John Scotus may have been the one to flesh out these ideas more fully, he was not the only one to give voice to them. The idea of two organically related revelations — by way of visible creation and by way of Scripture — an idea whose beginnings were to be found in a passage of the *De principiis*,[48] was one that was often cultivated. Like the world, Scripture is "created" by God,[49] and conversely the world is "written" by him, as if it were a book. Scripture and the world alike are symbolized in the Book of Revelation by the book that has writing inside and outside and is sealed with seven seals.[50] For "the whole of this sensible world," say Hugh and Richard of Saint Victor, "is like a book written by the finger of God."[51] All the beings that it is comprised of "are like so many figures, not invented by human ingenuity, but established by the divine will, so as to manifest and signify in some way the hidden attributes of divinity."[52] Creation was bequeathed to man "as a sort of incarnate and visible gospel," says Herbert of Bosham.[53] Saint Gregory had spoken of "the well-considered likeness of creation, which is akin to something that the mind can read."[54]

There is another way of expressing this analogy: the visible world is the first garment of godhead, Scripture being the second. It is a double tunic, says Aelred of Rievaulx. God uses it to protect our eyes, tempering the brightness of his inaccessible light in a dual way so that we might not be rendered utterly blind. Those who are attached solely to the letter and the variety of its details are like those who come to a stop at the shimmering surface of this world. They do not penetrate through to the life-giving spirit, to the hidden godhead. "While they are at pains to take care of the garment, they neglect the One whom the garment covers."[55] Garnier of Rochefort, who depends directly on John Scotus, returns to this idea of the two books, "the law" and "the world,"[56] which are both great in their superficial extent, but small nonetheless in their primary meaning, if we contrast them with either the book of human consciousness or, indeed, that book which is the Word of God. This book of the Word of God comprehends all the others, and although it is signified by them, it explains them. Even more than this, it contains everything that cannot enter into the heart of man. . . .[57] If our understanding, says Peter Lombard, had not been darkened by sin, it would not have had need of any other book than that of the world in order to come to know God.[58] But in this day and age, our understanding derives some modicum of intelligible meaning from this "great workshop of the world," which has become almost entirely opaque, only "with great effort and difficulty and with long labor."[59] It needs a second, more readable book, in order to afford itself an explanation

of the first book. Moreover, the Holy Spirit, the "finger of God," who had already shaped the letters of creation, went back to work in order to draft this new book. He unfurled the heavens of Scripture. He spread out this second firmament, which, like the first, recounts God's power and also his mercy, the latter of which it is much better at showing than is the first book.[60] Thanks to him, "the eye of contemplation" is conveyed to us, and every creature becomes a theophany for us once again.[61] "Scripture explicates the things that creation shows to be good."[62]

Similarly, the idea of an inexhaustible depth and unlimited richness of meaning was to find many symbols to express itself. The ancient Fathers had compared Scripture to a robe that was worn by the royal bride, woven of gold with a thousand colors.[63] Pseudo-Dionysius had compared it to "sacred veils" through which the divine rays gleam.[64] Many would take up these or other analogous images, like that of the "many-threaded coat" that God the Father weaves for his Son just as Jacob had done for Joseph.[65] Many would develop the traditional images of the fountain and the well, as did Gregory,[66] Bede,[67] Honorius,[68] Irimbert of Admont,[69] and Isaac of Stella.[70] The *Libri carolini* speaks of the "fountain that gushes forth from the precincts of heaven":[71] the more water that is drawn from it, the less it is depleted.[72] Aponius refers to "the broad array of senses, the expansive spaces of Divine Scripture."[73] A priest named Gilbert — possibly Gilbert of Stanford or Gilbert of Hoyland — describes this fertile field in which something always remains to be gleaned after the harvest, this bountiful vineyard where there are always some grapes to pick after the vintage. He explains that there is much more to be had than may be gotten by gleaning or picking:

> For you know that the words of Sacred Scripture, when they have been gleaned for a first and second vintage, can be squeezed so as to yield a rich and intoxicating liquid, as if it were usual for them, laden with sacred meanings as they are, to flow again even as if they had never been touched in the first place.[74]

Saint Gregory had said the same thing, by explaining that Scripture, inasmuch as it is inspired by God, surpasses the loftiest minds by the same degree to which these minds are inferior to God: they are incapable of perceiving any of its spiritual sublimity, except in the measure to which the goodness of God reveals it to them.[75] Saint John of the Cross reiterates this idea: "In spite of all their commentaries, the holy doctors, together with all those who could be numbered in their ranks, have never fully

interpreted Scripture: human words cannot enclose what the Spirit of God reveals."[76] Newman would reiterate these sentiments, in a passage worthy of Saint Gregory:

> (Scripture) cannot, as it were, be mapped, or its contents catalogued; but after all our diligence, to the end of our lives and to the end of the Church, it must be an unexplored and unsubdued land, with heights and valleys, forests and streams, on the right and left of our path and close about us, full of concealed wonders and choice treasures.[77]

Saint Bernard had recalled the cause of this inexhaustible profusion, namely, the Holy Spirit himself, who, in his unity, is nonetheless "a many-sided Spirit":

> For not without reason is the Spirit described by the wise man as many-sided, precisely because it has been his habit frequently to hide different understandings of wisdom under the exterior guise of the letter.[78]

Coming as it does from this "many-sided Spirit" and fertilized as it is by him, Scripture is therefore "capable of harboring innumerable modes of thought,"[79] as Aelred of Rievaulx says. And in this way, Rupert remarked, "many distinguished minds will be kept hard at work in many different ways."[80] "The diverse modes of thought that can be found in the inmost depths of the literature of heaven"[81] are like the sand that lies scattered along the seashore.

As for the eclecticism that could be deduced from all this, an eclecticism which is somewhat superficial in our eyes, but which was already espoused by Origen,[82] more still by Saint Augustine[83] and Saint Gregory[84] — "one form of knowledge is not hindered by another"[85] — outlines of it can likewise be found everywhere. Some of the texts already cited display this. Of these let us merely survey again the four utterances that follow by way of example. The first belongs to John Scotus:

> and so no interpreter's articulation of meaning abrogates somebody else's structure of meaning, provided that what each of them says agrees with a sound profession of the Catholic faith.[86]

Isaac of Stella provides us with the second example:

> The Wisdom of God truly takes many shapes, even though it is very simple, and although it is uniformly one, it is nonetheless found to be many-sided in many ways . . . .
>
> For this reason it often happens that those who disagree about the same Scriptural passages or who espouse different ideas about things can be in the highest agreement or harmony with the Holy Spirit. This is only provided that there has been a decision made not to disagree with the truth of the faith, the building up of charity, and the rooting out of cupidity. Everyone is vigilant about these matters when it comes to Sacred Scripture. For everyone involved is in agreement about things one way or another, at one time or another. But there is no room for choice between one Spirit and another. On both sides of the issue, as has been mentioned, there exists a harmonious relationship with truth and charity.[87]

The third example can be found in Philip of Harvengt:

> In many places Divine Scripture has a variety of meanings, none of which merits being rejected, although one meaning may be approved to a greater extent than the other.[88]

The fourth and final example belongs to the Abbot Wolberon:

> The two Testaments are said to be small murena-like fish, inasmuch as they can be bent and shaped into different kinds of explanatory narratives. They are, moreover, amenable to many points of view, so long as nothing is said that is contrary to faith.[89]

It is still too early to make a judgment about all this. It is too early even to see its complete significance. In any case, it is impossible to understand unless one is mindful of the traditional belief in the inspiration of Scripture. This traditional belief does not consider the fact of inspiration as something merely "in the process of becoming,"[90] but rather "as existing in point of fact."[91] It is not only the sacred writers who were inspired one fine day. The sacred books themselves are and remain inspired. It can and must be said of them, with especially good reason, what Saint Augustine said of all the beings of creation:

> God did not create them and then depart from the scene. They come from him and exist in him.[92]

Thus Scripture is not merely divinely guaranteed. It is divinely true. The Spirit did not merely dictate it. The Spirit immured himself in it, as it were. He lives in it. His breath has always animated it. Scripture is "fertilized by a miracle of the Holy Spirit."[93] It is full of the Spirit.[94]

> "The marvelous depths of your eloquence. . . . Its marvelous depths, my God, its marvelous depths!"[95]

2. Multiple Meanings

The rehearsal of these general insights is quite relevant to our design. They form a sort of backdrop against which will be placed all the more precise information that we will need to gather. Nevertheless, these general insights have nothing to say yet about an organic and specified multiplicity of meanings. Although it is quite far from being simply equivalent to what has since that time been denominated as the "plurality of literal meanings," this idea of "various, multiple styles of speech in the Sacred Literature"[1] is not at all adequate when it comes to constituting a doctrine of spiritual understanding. Spread out visibly along the surface, like the colors of the light spectrum, or, to use another simile, passing tier by tier through different degrees of depth, the infinity of meanings established by this idea does not yet constitute a structure.

It is the traditional theory of the triple or quadruple sense that gives us this structure. Except, as often happens, it does not appear in the works of all the authors in its integrity or its purity. It can be present without being formulated clearly and distinctly in any text, while a like text with an appearance of distinct clarity can merely present a superficial translation of it or even a counterfeit. On the other hand, it would be wrong to attach importance to just any aberrant list. Of certain outsiders, those with ingenious and complicated minds, it can be said, echoing Father Christian Pesch, that: "they beg to differ and hold that the multiplicity of Scripture's senses undergoes an increase."[2] According to the circumstances, this can be a whim or a blunder. It can also be attributed to simple expediency of interpretation. Or else it may have a doctrinal purpose: we shall see an illustrious example in what follows with reference to Joachim of Flora. Sometimes it is merely a matter of variants, and most of the time it is not too difficult to fit them into a more classical formula. Thus, in the preface to his explication of the Psalter, Cassiodorus distinguishes in a way that is not customary between the "spiritual

understanding" and the "mystical sense."[3] Between the two of these he brackets the "historical reading."[4] Thus Richard of Saint Victor (?), commenting on the prophet Nahum, finds four different significations for the city of Nineveh, according to whether it is envisaged "historically, allegorically, mystically," or "morally."[5] It is clear — and this will be seen better in what follows — that in this list the sense that is called mystical is also one that is commonly called "allegorical," whereas the sense that Richard calls "allegorical" does not correspond to the customary definition of Christian allegory, but overlaps somewhat with the "tropological" sense in one of its two accepted meanings. What is more, Richard does not stop there,[6] and it is a more common division that he takes up somewhat further on, when he finds four meanings for the sea.[7] Perhaps we have a case here of temporary notations rather than general schemes. This is the way Claude of Turin seems, at one point, to sketch out the idea of a fivefold sense.[8] He stops short before he gives any precise details. In the sketch that Sigebert of Gembloux devotes to his own works, he tells us that he has translated Ecclesiastes "in an heroic measure."[9] To this he adds that: "I have divided it into a threefold miscellany that is literal, allegorical, and mythological."[10] Peter Comestor says one time: "A general, particular, and final understanding lies hidden here."[11] If the first two of these epithets correspond well to allegory and tropology, the third scarcely corresponds to anagogy.[12] As for Garnier of Rochefort, he will quite seriously attribute as many as six superimposed senses to realities such as the Tabernacle, the Temple, or the Holy City. And he does this without counting their historical sense:

> Each and every one of the words is ambiguous in many ways. For sometimes the word is meant emphatically, sometimes antonomastically, sometimes specifically, sometimes allegorically, sometimes anagogically, and sometimes tropologically. When the word is meant emphatically, that is to say, distinctly, it means Christ. . . . When it is meant specifically, it means the Virgin Mary. . . . When it is meant allegorically, it signifies the universal Church. . . . When it is meant anagogically . . . it is a figure of the celestial Church. . . . When it is meant tropologically, it signifies the whole man. . . .[13]

And each one of these attributions is ingeniously justified — except that no example is adduced for the "antonomastic" sense and no definition of it is even given.[14] What we have here is complication through subdivisions, sheer embellishment by an overly subtle preacher in a somewhat

decadent age, erected upon a more sober, classical foundation which Garnier himself recalls on other occasions. Much later, meditating on those words of the Gospel according to Saint John, which say that "He came forth from God and goes back to God," Gerson would appear to attribute to them by turns an historical sense, a metaphysical sense, a theological sense, and a moral sense. In reality, he merely subdivides the literal sense in two, before appending a moral sense to it.[15]

A list of the seven senses merits particular attention, because it is rooted in deeply traditional themes. It is the fruit of the fascination exerted on some minds by the seven seals of the Book of Revelation.[16] The credit for this elaboration, according to scholars like F. H. Dudden,[17] H. Caplan,[18] Beryl Smalley,[19] and C. Spicq,[20] generally goes to Angelome of Luxeuil, who was writing in the middle of the ninth century. This consensus is not entirely without foundation. M. L. W. Laistner, however, has caught a glimpse of a possible source.[21] In point of fact, all the elements, at least, of Angelome's text are borrowed.

The sealed book seen by the Prophet to the right of Him who was seated on the throne was the book of "divine economies," the book "of God's designs for human history"; in other words, according to an almost unanimous exegesis, which specifies its significance rather than changes it, this was the book of the Scriptures,[22] "The Two Testaments, by which each and every one is to be judged," says Aimon.[23] The Lamb, who alone was declared capable of opening the Book, was Christ: "The innocent lamb has marvelous ways of discussing the father's commands, which are signed with seven seals."[24]

The contents of the inside of the Book consisted of the Gospel, in other words, the Mystery of Christ.[25] Since there were seven seals, there was a natural tendency to elaborate this mystery into seven parts, even though other considerations might more readily have supported the tendency to subdivide it into four parts,[26] and even though the mystery was recognized as unique and singular in itself. Each one of these seven parts, phases, or aspects was readily linked with one of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. Sometimes, too, the linkage was with the seven great patriarchs.[27] The mystery took its rise with the Incarnation of the Word in the womb of the Virgin, and was consummated or rather had its blossoming in the ultimate reign of Christ after the Last Judgment. This is what we find in the work of Apringius of Beja in the sixth century,[28] and then in Ildephonsus of Toledo (?),[29] not to mention Heterius and Beatus,[30] and then after that in Alcuin,[31] Peter Damian,[32] Bruno of Segni,[33] Rupert, and also Pseudo-Thomas.[34] The lists, the origin of which some have wanted to explain by

a particularity of the Mozarabic Rite,[35] admit of a few variants. But these variants are unimportant, for they do not involve the least bit of doctrinal incompatibility. It is always a case of "the seven mysteries of Christ," of "the seven sacraments of our redemption, prefigured in the law and predicted by the prophets."[36] Sometimes, subsequently, we find seven less chronologically portioned out aspects of the same mystery.[37] Whatever way things are arranged, the unity of the mystery that is thus expressed is not lost sight of — any more than it is when the mystery is subdivided into four parts by reason of the four symbolic animals or four rivers by which the incarnation, the sacrificial death, the resurrection, and the ascension are seen to be signified.[38] It is always the unity of a mystery that embraces the totality of faith: "And the seven seals are so mutually consistent," explains Bruno of Segni, "that he who knows one of them has no doubts about the others. . . . Thus there are seven seals and seven mysteries, which by and large contain our faith."[39] Or we have Peter Damian, who speaks of "those seven sacraments, with which the whole order of the Lord's dispensation is filled."[40] It concerns "the faith that encompasses the Lord's incarnation and all his sacraments."[41]

Yet the number seven was already fascinating in and of itself. Other speculations have also been grafted onto this text from the Book of Revelation. Not the least strange of these speculations is certainly the one sketched out by Primasius of Hadrumetum,[42] which, in the grammatical fervor that characterized their era, men like Ambrose Autpert (†784), Alcuin,[43] and Aimon of Auxerre were eager to reproduce.[44] According to this line of thought, the seven seals were seven "modes of speaking" or "modes of discourse," "which even worldly authors showed that they were able to take into account in their discourses":[45] "indicative, pronunciative, imperative, optative, conjunctive, infinitive," and, with a view to obtaining the desired number, "impersonal." Later, at a time of fervently cloistered monastic life, Petrus Cellensis would come to recognize in this the seven "reasons" that keep the heart and the lips of the monk closed in silence.[46] While these are mere curiosities, others are either more commonplace[47] or more strange.[48] With more objectivity, if we can use this term, some asked themselves the following question: since the history of salvation had to be unfolded in seven stages, did not each of the seven seals protect the secret of one of these stages, whether we make our reckoning from the time of the ancient promise of a Redeemer[49] or from the time of his coming, the time of the early Church's first glory and first struggles to the time of its eternal rest.[50] Only at that point would all the seals be removed. Only at that point would everything be uncovered.[51] Scripture, having been

merged with the great Book of Life, would have yielded its final secrets. In another chapter we shall see the consequences of these theories, for it was through them that a dangerously slippery slope was embarked upon.

These were the most widespread explications. Thus there was a twofold fullness of time, a twofold coming of Christ. The first coming had revealed the hidden meaning of the ancient Scripture. The second coming would cause this meaning to become manifest in the full light of day. In both cases, it was ever a matter of the same mystery, of that unique mystery, that was to remain veiled, albeit in a different way, until the time established by the Lord.[52] Whether it be the mystery of Scripture, the mystery of the history of salvation, or the mystery of Christ, it was always likewise the mystery bestowed and then revealed by the sevenfold Spirit. It was precisely about the Spirit that the Book of Revelation had spoken in a symbolic way by alluding to the "seven spirits of God," symbolized themselves by the seven torches of fire and by the seven eyes of the Lamb.[53] At the same time, therefore, this is all about the *mystery* of the *Spirit.* Hence, to enter deeply into its significance — as far as it is given to man to do so — was to achieve the *mystic* or *spiritual* meaning of it.[54]

Except we find that two different explanations could still be given of the number seven. It should be recalled that this "mystic number,"[55] this strange number, which "arises from nothing and does not beget nor is begotten,"[56] was, like the number twelve, with which it is closely linked, the number of fullness and of universality: "the mysterious sign of a certain kind of universality,"[57] it was said, the lead having been taken from Saint Augustine[58] and Saint Gregory.[59] This notion held sway "as readily among secular philosophers as among ecclesiastical ones," specifies Rupert of Deutz.[60] Was not universal time encompassed by the seven days of the week? Since that time, without looking any further, just as the universal gifts, the inextinguishable gifts of the Spirit,[61] could be seen to be signified by the seven gifts, similarly the book with inexhaustible depths could be construed by the book sealed seven times: "sealed with seven seals, covered with the manifold fullness of hidden mysteries."[62] Or else a person could let himself be tempted anew by a fragmentary explication, and, just as the mystery had been divided into seven parts, he could divide it again, in terms of its depth, so to speak, into seven layers or seven degrees: this is how we end up positing the seven senses of Scripture.

Once again the leader here is Primasius, although the seven "modes" that he enumerates are still not seven meanings that can be superimposed in the explication of the same text. Primasius readily admits that the

number seven signifies universality and that as a result the book that is sealed with seven seals, which is the Old Testament not yet explained by the New Testament, is the book that is "covered with the manifold fullness of hidden mysteries." Only his declaration does not stop there. Yielding to a temptation that Saint Gregory would overcome,[63] but which would entrap others,[64] he adds immediately: "I believe, however, that seven modes, like the seven seals, ought to be sought openly and vigorously in divine Scriptures."[65] The seven verbal modes which we have seen are the first to present themselves to his searching mind. He does not reject them, but he does, however, think that an explication of this kind is inadequate, given the importance of the text: "As for the preceding modes of speech, although they seem fitting in some way, they are to be judged as inadequate for the subject that we are inquiring into."[66] Besides the fact that the explication lacks depth, it does not show how it is that Scripture contained a secret that the coming of Christ was bound to uncover, which is how the author of the Book of Revelation bids us to see it:

> Therefore, when we are researching into Scripture, the first level of text deals with the historical action, while the second deals with the allegorical texture. The third level is perceived as a mode encompassing both these levels. The fourth level is about the unchangeable essence of the divine Trinity, when in its own peculiar way it is figuratively introduced into the sacred oracles. The fifth level is parabolic, because it is effected as much by the way a thing is narrated as by its action, so that when one thing is said and another is found in the writing, the mind is lifted to the pastures of spiritual understanding. The sixth level concerns the twin comings of the Savior. Let not the first of these comings be confused with the second or the second with the first, for there should be a strict and careful application of distinctions to these two comings. Hence the minds of the Jews were darkened when the Lord came, and even now they labor under the same cloud of ignorance to such an extent that sometimes the prophecy of future actions or the secrets of spiritual meanings are proposed to account even for men's sins and transgressions. Furthermore, the seventh mode is one that has to be treated with much care. It is by this mode that we are instructed by divine precepts in such a way that the certain form of how life should be lived out and the manner of life's significance are made known to others in an exemplary way. In this area there is a distinct and separate acknowledgement of what is written outwardly and what is inside.[67]

Already this simple statement shows that, in the mind of Primasius, the seven modes in question do not affect each text. The examples that he gives later prove this clearly.[68] But in the mind of one or another of his successors a certain confusion ensued.

It is well known that the commentary of Primasius, who himself used Tyconius's commentary,[69] now lost, served as a basis for several others. Nevertheless, the explication that we have just finished reading was, to my knowledge, retained by only three authors: Ambrosius Autpertus, Aimon of Auxerre, and Angelome of Luxeuil. Bede, despite his numerous borrowings from Primasius, is well content here to link the seven seals with the seven rules of Tyconius,[70] those "mystical rules of a sort," as Saint Augustine called them.[71] These rules were themselves, moreover, not unrelated to the "mystical meanings." As for Autpertus, he is suspicious of Tyconius.[72] In turn, the high esteem in which, despite his obscurity, he holds Primasius, "a man who is totally Catholic and learned in the area of Divine Scriptures,"[73] prompts him to reproduce entire pages from him. That is the case with our subject. The whole passage on the seven "modes," together with supporting examples, is transcribed by him almost word for word.[74] With a bit more touching up in its editorial stages, this passage is found again in the commentary by Aimon (†855).[75] In spite of Alcuin's abstention,[76] what we had here for some time was a kind of tradition. A short while later Angelome of Luxeuil refers to it, saying that: "the ingenuity of the doctors attests to it."[77] This passage does not occur, as in the case of Autpertus or Aimon, in his commentary on the Book of Revelation. It occurs, rather, in the preface to his explication of the Book of Kings. And what amounts to a more essential difference, it is not a matter merely, in Angelome, of seven "modes" (although the word still arises in his treatment)[78] but rather of seven senses or meanings. Perhaps it is a case of both these words coming into play at once in a line of thought that remains confused. A theory of this kind doubtless satisfied his desire to show the doctrinal richness and the "many-sided wisdom" of the books that were apparently the most dryly historical, while at the same time he encompassed all the connected aspects of the mystery of faith in his biblical exegesis:

> It is to be noted by those who maintain that too little of a spiritual nature is contained in this book, that in this instance Scripture, as is the case in many of the divine volumes, is not thought to be comprised of only three modes, in accordance with that saying of Solomon's, "Behold, I have described it in three ways," but even of multiple

> modes, according to what is written in the book of blessed Job: "And would that God," he said, "were speaking with you and showing you the secrets of his wisdom, and that his law is manifold." Note that, as the ingenuity of the doctors attests, these modes are perceived as being seven in number. For there are in fact seven seals, with which, according to John's Book of Revelation, that book is proclaimed to be sealed. . . . For there are historical, etc.[79]

Following this, there is an enumeration which we are already aware of, then a list of examples which coincide only very partially with the list that can be read, almost without any changes, in the work of Primasius, Autpertus, and Aimon. Here Angelome refers naturally to those books of Kings which he undertakes to provide a commentary for.[80]

The mechanical enumeration was not difficult.[81] Nor was it too difficult, in order to illustrate each of the cases, to find some examples in the sacred texts. But this was predicated on a surreptitious return to the thinking of Primasius and a renunciation of the attempt to transform the seven modes of Scripture into seven significances of its text. As for a transition toward the attempt to apply this hypothesis of seven significances to a coherent commentary, this turned out to be impossible. Angelome himself did not attempt an endeavor of this kind. Immediately after having adduced his examples, at the end of his preface, we see him declare that in practice he will hold fast to the quite usual tripartite division as to an indispensable minimum:

> Yet, although those modes are found in manifold ways therein, we have, however, as a result of the continuance of the threefold division, been eager first of all to touch on history, which produces actions, then to reveal the allegorical significance, which builds up faith, and lastly also to add morality, which orders an honorable life. In this way, pressed by the weight of one, sole understanding, or burdened down by the heavy bulk of history and allegory, a person could not lazily seize on an excuse, but rather be challenged to find the strength to run joyfully through the broad fields cultivated by the learned doctors by relying on these modest means.[82]

Therefore, let us imitate Angelome, and after this excursion through a few aberrant lists, let us also return to the division of the senses that is the most classic. Let us concentrate our attention on this division, so that we may draw doctrinal teaching from it as a result.

3. The First Formula

But where is this authentic doctrine to be found? Which texts, which authors, which eras are to be retained? If, in fact, the whole of the medieval tradition is considered, even while the more or less exceptional cases are left aside, there is a manifest duality. Father Alberto Vaccari and Father C. Spicq have noticed this. About the exegetes of the twelfth century, Father Spicq tells us that: "some, following Origen and Jerome, maintain a trichotomy: history, morality or tropology, and mysticism or allegory; others make use of the quadruple distinction of Cassian and Augustine, which was taken up by Bede and Rabanus Maurus: history, allegory, tropology, and anagogy."[1] According to some historians, this duality is more a matter of two successive stages. But it is a curious thing that, depending on who is consulted, the order of succession finds itself inverted. For Father Vaccari, the quadruple distinction would only begin to find favor, by and large, at the outset of the first half of the thirteenth century, whereas before that time the trichotomy held sway. Although it would have been possible to find a few rare antecedents for it, starting with Cassian, it would not yet have made more than just a "timid appearance" in the course of the twelfth century.[2] It may be that this is an excessive attempt at schematization. For P. C. Boeren, on the contrary, it is more by way of novelty that the trichotomy could be said to be "characteristic of the twelfth century." If "the ideal of a quadruple distinction," which had held sway in previous times, was still being maintained, at least "what was actually being practiced did not accord with it."[3] In reality, however, the duality is simultaneous, and Father Spicq has done well to draw our attention to the ancient origin of both ways of considering the question.

Only — and this time it was Father Vaccari who made the observation — the main interest of the distinction between the two formulas does not lie in numerical differences: an enumeration of three senses on the one hand and four senses on the other. If we rested content with this, there would be nothing with which to make a distinction between the "two currents," as it is customary to say. Their being simultaneous rather than successive would not amount to a difference. Already Saint Isidore of Seville, in his zeal to collect all the givens of tradition, mentioned the four senses (or "modes") and the three senses consecutively in the same work,[4] Guibert de Nogent tells us that at Bec Saint Anselm trained his pupils to take note of "a triple or a quadruple sense" in Scripture, and that for him the same thing applies.[5] In fact, it is not very important, for example, that

an author like this should forget to add anagogy to his list — unless he absorbs it quite consciously into allegory — or that another such author mentions it as occupying the fourth place. This does not introduce an essential modification to the structure of the formula. For reasons of artificial symbolism or correspondences, which we shall see in their place,[6] it happens that certain writers hold to the number three, just as others hold to the number four. Robert of Melun (†1167) would write: "Some writers are in the habit of adding anagogy. According to them Sacred Scripture will not be *a rope with three strands*, but rather one with four strands. As for ourselves, we believe that anagogy is contained in allegory";[7] as a result, after the other components, he would subdivide allegory "into simple allegory and anagogy."[8] It happens, too, that one author, without changing the order of his list at all, sometimes includes three components in it and sometimes four. That is why the author of the *Mirror on the Mysteries of the Church*,[9] a disciple of Hugh of Saint Victor, writes in chapter 3 about "the fourfold sense of the Scriptures . . . that is to say, the historical, allegorical, tropological, and anagogical senses"[10] and then, in chapter 7, explains that "Sacred Scripture . . . has three senses, that is to say, the historical, allegorical, and moral."[11] In the Prologue to the first book of the *De sacramentis* the same duality can be observed, although it is less visible. In chapters 4 and 7 Hugh enumerates three senses. But in chapter 6, after the same enumeration, he adds: "Over and above all these things is that divine element, to which Divine Scripture leads the way, whether it be through allegory or through tropology," which seems to be a kind of definition of anagogy, the fourth and highest sense.[12] It happens again with Hugh that even while he always speaks of a threefold sense, he subdivides the second sense, as does Robert of Melun, by an explicit mention of this anagogy.[13] Others, who count only three terms, find themselves omitting — really or apparently — not anagogy, but tropology. This is the case with Pseudo-Bede in his commentary on Saint Matthew[14] and with the author of the *Miscellaneae sententiae*.[15] We find it also in a passage from Adam Scotus.[16] The approach of the latter is most significant. He forever hesitates between the tripartite division, the promise of which is held forth to the reader by the very title of his great work, *De tripartito tabernaculo*, and the quadripartite division which is recommended to him by the image of the four-legged tabernacle table.[17] Similarly, Stephen Langton speaks sometimes of three senses and sometimes of four.[18] Likewise Innocent III, as well as others. Finally, just as an apparently triple sense can in reality be quadruple, through a more or less explicit subdivision of one of its terms into two, likewise an apparently quadruple sense can be

merely triple in reality. This is what happens, for example, when, by a division in two of the second term, allegory, there is a successive exposition of allegory relative to Christ and allegory relative to the Church. This is what Richard of Saint Victor (?) does in a long unfolding of his commentary on Nahum.[19] This is also what Aelred of Rievaulx does, when he distinguishes between two kinds of mystic nuptials, "one, in which human nature has wedded the one Word of God, and the other, in which the Church has wedded Christ as her bridegroom,"[20] before coming to the nuptials in which "the perfect soul is wedded to God daily."[21] Let this be said by way of still general comment, in terms of a first approximation.

On the other hand, this way of counting by either threes or fours is encountered in each of the two above-mentioned groups right from the beginning of the Middle Ages and continues on throughout the period. In other words — to take the most frequent grounds for differentiation — anagogy can just as easily be present in the first formula, the one which Spicq tells us comes from Origen and Jerome, as absent from the second formula, the one which he associates with Cassian and Saint Augustine through the mediation of Saint Bede and Rabanus Maurus. Here, for example, is a representative of the first group from the ninth century, Prudentius of Troyes. He writes that: "The four-horse team favored by this approach are the four kinds of divine eloquence, namely, history, ethics, allegory, and anagogy. By means of these we are led, through the illumination of grace, to all understanding of sacred letters."[22] There is another somewhat more ancient example, that of the two Spaniards Heterius of Osma and Beatus of Liebana, in whose work the same sequence is to be found: "the letter, tropology, mystic understanding (= allegory), and anagogy."[23] This was the sequence given by Isidore of Seville in his *Liber de variis quaestionibus*. Other examples could be added, although these occur later: Aelred of Rievaulx and Peter Lombard.[24]

In turn, the Venerable Bede, whom the second group has as its spokesman, and who knows the four terms, remains content nonetheless with three on several occasions. And these three are not always the same ones. In fact, in his *Hexaemeron* he says: "In Sacred Scripture there is a threefold meaning . . . namely historical, allegorical, and anagogical."[25] On the other hand, in his commentary on Leviticus he asserts: "For truly an understanding of Scriptures is threefold: historical, mystical, and moral."[26] In his commentary on Proverbs, concerning the text, "lurking outside sometimes, sometimes on the streets, and sometimes in corners,"[27] he says similarly: "It makes sense that by a reference to three places a tripartite understanding of Sacred Scripture should be arrived at. . . ."[28] Then he

goes on to enumerate history, allegory, and morality in the same order.[29] Here one recognizes that it is the specific occasion that prompts him to count three terms rather than four. An excerpt from his commentary on the Book of Samuel allows us to ascertain the flexible component in this enumeration of the senses. There he speaks of a double understanding of Scripture. But for him this double interpretation is at the same time a "triple argument"[30] and includes, as he says straight off, three successive senses. And it could be said as well that in enumerating these three senses he really counts four or even five of them, for in the explanations that follow it can be seen that one of the three senses, allegory, is subdivided naturally into three:

> [The disciples of the Lord] gave a double interpretation of the Scriptures, so that after the first one, namely, a reading of the history, which before his incarnation was fulfilled by the law, he might himself disclose both the allegorical and anagogical sense. By the action of a new dispensation that had been inaugurated, this allegorical and anagogical sense was congruent with the truth of present grace or the blessedness of future life . . .
>
> . . . Often we examine the literal surface by busily considering what it contains that is allegorically congruent with the mysteries of Christ, with the state of the Catholic Church, and with the censure of a person's morals. . . .[31]

Those who follow Bede for the order that he adopts often hold fast, as he does himself, to three terms. An example is Angelome of Luxeuil,[32] but there are others, too, who will be cited later. Another example would be Guerric, the Cistercian abbot of Igny, who says:

> You could use three ways to speak about what was written for us, describing it as being ample and refreshing fare in the form of the three loaves of history, allegory, and morality,[33] etc.

Or we have Luke, the abbot of Mont Cornillon:

> O you who examine the spiritual law, there are three things that underlie your research into the divine page, namely, history, allegory, and morality.[34]

We also have a writer as early as Rufinus of Aquileia, who expresses

himself in quite a methodical fashion when he proffers an interpretation of the successive blessings of the Patriarchs:

> To us this matter suggests a thematic explanation that is comprised of three parts. We have done this when dealing with other matters. Thus it is that the blessings corroborate the place of history, while prophecy takes in hand the mystical and dogmatic approach, and moralistic reproaches and reproofs take in hand the moral dimension of things.[35]

What is more, someone like Thomas of Perseigne can be seen, in his commentary on the Song of Songs, to enumerate four senses at the outset, as he adopts the formula of the first group, and then to count only three when he adopts the formula of the second group.[36]

What is even more important, or rather the only thing that is important, as long, at least, as we are not going back to the earliest beginnings, is the order in which the three or four senses are portioned out.[37] More precisely, it is the respective place that is occupied, on both sides, by the second and third terms of the enumeration. For in this regard an overwhelming and persistent duality can be observed. If all those quite numerous lists of Scriptural senses that one finds were to be put in a chronological series, starting with the high Middle Ages, it would have to be said that in each century, depending on the author, there are two patterns evident: sometimes morals or tropology precedes allegory, or mystical understanding, as in the texts of Origen and Saint Jerome, to which Spicq makes reference, while at other times, in contrast, morals follow allegory, as in the works of Bede and Rabanus Maurus. In this chapter, let us be content to record this fact in its material reality.

Among the authors who give priority to morals, the first to be cited will be Saint Eucher.[38] It is his text that we shall have to study in the following chapter. Heterius of Osma and Beatus of Liebana both distinguish at length between the literal or historical, followed by tropology, and then the spiritual or mystical understanding. All three of these are necessary in order to form the "whole book" which the Christian has to assimilate, so that the whole man in him, made up, not only of body, but of soul and spirit, might be nourished, and so that he might receive the whole Christ, who is flesh, soul, and Word.[39] The same sequence can be found in Berengaud[40] and, as we have seen, in Prudentius of Troyes (†861).[41] Faithful to the concordism noted above, John Scotus posits an "ethical" sense as coming after the literal sense, and then a "physical"

sense, and finally a "theoretical" sense. That is to say, he follows the first sense, which corresponds to the vulgar understanding, with a sense that relates to "virtue" and "action," and then another sense that relates to "science," and finally another that relates to "theology" or "contemplation."[42] In the eleventh century, in his Prologue to the account of Saint Amand's miracles, Gislibert of Saint Amand writes:

> O Lord God, grant that we may make an interwoven pattern of these deeds,
> Furnishing them alternately with a moral sense and a spiritual sense,
> Joining them together in an interconnected way.[43]

Manegold of Lautenbach († ca. 1108) says that the soul is entirely converted "by adding the moral sense over and above the historical sense and then adding the spiritual sense on top of that."[44] In the twelfth century, the author of the commentary on the Psalms issued under the name of Remi of Auxerre distinguishes similarly between "history, morality, and mystery."[45] In the pages of Scripture, William of Saint Thierry († ca. 1158) first considers the things that are recounted in it, then the moral teaching that is drawn from it by the doctors, and finally its mysteries. For Abelard (†1142), the "triple exposition" contains "the perfection of doctrine" and provides an abundance of nourishment. A variety of delights can be found laid out on this spiritual table of Abelard's "triple exposition," which is successively "historical, moral, and mystic."[46] It is in following this order that he takes pains to search the unfathomable depths of the Book of Genesis.[47] Rupert of Deutz describes the "triple rule" of understanding, whose framework is "history, tropology, and spiritual understanding or spiritual contemplation."[48] He goes on to speak of "useful histories, or moral doctrines, or allegorical expositions."[49] Thus Aelred (†1166) enumerates the "four faces" of Scripture: "Its first face is history, the next is morality, the third is allegory, and the fourth is anagogy, that is to say, a sense of the higher things."[50] In commenting on the gospel account of Cana, another Cistercian, Isaac, the abbot of Etoile (†1169), distinguishes between four kinds of nuptials: "the first are historical, the second moral, the third allegorical, and the fourth anagogical."[51] He goes on to extend this division to his understanding of "Jewish literature" as a whole.[52] Zachary of Besançon († ca. 1155), who often depends on Abelard, adopts the same order,[53] as does Peter Lombard, who in a sermon with a very scholastic aspect to it, distinguishes learnedly between moral, allegorical, and "anagogetical" understandings, in addition to historical understand-

ing.[54] This is the order that can still be found in Absalon,[55] Amadeus of Lausanne,[56] and Peter of Blois († after 1204),[57] and that would be found again in several of the scholastics of the great era, such as Ulrich of Strasbourg, and then in some later authors, notably Walter Hilton, author of the *Scala perfectionis* (†1396)[58] and Denys the Carthusian.[59] Later still, it would make an appearance in the work of Sixtus of Siena.

By way of example of this first formula, the expression given to it by Beatus of Liebana in his celebrated commentary on the Book of Revelation may be cited:

> . . . One offered gold, that is to say, the spiritual sense, which is mystical understanding in the Church. Another offered silver, that is to say, eloquence, which is a tropological or moral understanding. Still another offered something that had the ring of bronze, which represents historical understanding.
>
> For Holy Scripture is to be understood in three ways: the first is historical, the second is tropological, and the third is mystical. For an historical understanding is linked to the letter, a tropological one to moral science, and a mystical one to spiritual understanding. Thus we need to have a very tight grip on our Catholic faith, which will prompt us to read the Scriptures historically, interpret them morally, and understand them spiritually.[60]

4. The Second Formula

This first order came to be the only one adverted to by a number of moderns, even those who are learned.[1] This tradition goes back to the first generation of Protestants, notably Melanchthon in his *Rhetorica* and Flacius Illyricus in his *Clavis Scripturae.* For several successive centuries, writes Flacius,

> it was a quite acceptable practice for many to devise four senses for the Scriptures. . . . They said that the first of these was literal, the second moral or tropological, the third allegorical, and the fourth anagogical.[2]

However, as I have said, many of our ancient authors did, in fact, put allegory or the mystical sense immediately after the literal or historical sense, and this is not without its consequences.

Bede (ca. 673-735) adopts this order several times, using clear formulas[3] which were often to be reproduced,[4] and which Thomas Aquinas would cite again.[5] Preceding him was Saint Aldhelm of Sherborn (Salisbury) (ca. 640-709), who was situated at the juncture of the Irish and Roman traditions. Bede called him "the most learned man anywhere" and "a man who was extremely erudite in the area of Holy Scriptures."[6] Aldhelm was already aware of "allegorical and tropological disputation."[7] What is more, he knew — in an order that was different from the one that Saint Isidore had given — "the fourfold ecclesiastical tradition," which is to say, the custom of explaining Scripture "according to history, allegory, tropology, and anagogy,"[8] and he applied himself to the disentanglement of this fourfold explication of the "mystical commentaries" that we owe to "the Catholic Fathers."[9] At roughly the same time, if we can believe the author of his *Life*, we find Saint Boniface (680-726), who was "steeped in the simple exposition of history and the tripartite interpretation of the spiritual understanding."[10] And the case of Saint Aldhelm renders the situation very likely. It is thus doubly inexact to say, as did an author as serious as Loewe as late as 1957,[11] that Bede knows of only three senses and that it was possibly Walafrid Strabo who was the first to formulate the quadripartite division.[12]

The author of the little biblical glossary called the *Clavis Scripturae* was doubtless a Spaniard of the eighth century who depended on Saint Isidore, but was also able to draw on a much more ancient collection.[13] This Spaniard says that the two eyes of the Bride in the Song of Songs are the two mystical senses of Scripture: "the allegorical, which is said to be fairly pointed, and the moral, which is more pleasant and charming."[14] It is true, however, that it is hardly possible to speak of an order of succession when it comes to the two "eyes."[15] Around the beginning of the ninth century, this order is to be found in a sermon by Pseudo-Eligius.[16] In his commentary on the Letter to the Hebrews, Sedulius Scotus also places the "mystical" sense before the "tropological" sense,[17] and, in his commentary on the Letter to the Galatians, he enumerates "four types": "history, allegory, tropology, and anagogy."[18] A good many other writers of the ninth century adopt a similar order. This is the case of the Pseudo-Alcuin of the *Interpretationes nominum*,[19] as well as Amalarius, the great liturgist,[20] and Christian of Stavelot, in the approximate analogies he makes with physics, logic, and ethics.[21] This is, moreover, the order followed by Claudius of Turin (†827)[22] as well as his correspondent, the Abbot Theodemir.[23] It is also espoused by Walfrid Strabo,[24] Aimo of Auxerre,[25] and, later, Remigius of Auxerre († c. 908).[26] In his

commentary on the Book of Lamentations, Paschasius Radbertus is consistently faithful to this order. When he designates the second term, the one that follows immediately after history, he sometimes speaks of allegory, at other times anagogy, and still other times the mystical sense. This diversity of names, however, never disturbs the regularity of his scheme.[27] Turning to Angelome of Luxeuil, we find that he also reproduces the classic terms, speaking of "the historical, allegorical, and moral significance."[28] The only difference is that at times he expresses himself in a more freewheeling vocabulary, which amounts, even so, to the same thing. I have sought, he says, to extend history by a spiritual and moral understanding,

> so that history may bear upon the truth of deeds and the trustworthiness of the account, the spiritual understanding may lead to the mysteries of the heavenly forms, and moral suasion may summon us to a better life.[29]

In the eleventh century, Saint Peter Damian, drawing on a similar formulaic freedom, looks at such and such a fact reported by Scripture and discerns in it "the plain and unvarnished fact," and then "the sacred revelation of a spiritual understanding," and lastly "a pattern of virtue."[30] Or else, borrowing his images from the rhythms of nature, he says by way of transition from the second sense to the third:

> Once the foggy mists of allegory are dispelled, we can also draw on this rivulet of Scripture to irrigate our moral life.[31]

Odorannus applies himself to the "mystical interpretation" of the account before adding "the part that concerns morality."[32] Saint William Firmat († ca. 1095) demonstrates that Wisdom is the bride of the contemplative, inasmuch as from their mystical union there are born four sons, who are the four modes of understanding the sacred text, namely, the historical, allegorical, tropological, and anagogical senses.[33] Herbert de Losinga (ca. 1050-1119) is assured that allegory is hidden in history, and moral signficance in allegory.[34] Conrad of Hirschau, good pedagogue that he is, teaches "what the distinction is . . . between allegory, tropology, and anagogy." Then he goes on to emphasize the way they are connected: "First the teacher has to establish the literal sense. Then the letter of the text must be illumined by allegory, and after that the reader's life must be built up by morality."[35]

I have already cited Guibert de Nogent (†1124). He is in the habit of enumerating the four senses in the order indicated by Aldhelm and by Bede.[36] After him comes a swarming constellation of figures in the twelfth century. Among them we have to count Raoul of Saint Germer in Flaix († ca. 1157), author of a commentary on Leviticus that was very highly esteemed for a long time. Having distinguished between the "things" yielded by the letter and the "forms" that the "things" contain, Raoul adds that these forms "are either allegorical or moral or anagogical."[37] In their number we must also count the great popularizer Honorius († ca. 1153), making reference at once to his commentaries, his liturgical writings, his spiritual treatises, and his preaching.[38] Also to be included are Alexander of Canterbury (the Pseudo-Anselm of the *Liber de similitudinibus*)[39] and Odo of Canterbury.[40] For Hervé of Bourg-Dieu, "knowledge of the Scriptures" takes its rise "according to the historical, mystical, and moral senses."[41]

Often Hugh of Saint Victor himself (†1141) takes up the enumeration again. He does this not only in each of his great didactic works,[42] but even in his "minor" works, such as the *De arca Noe morali*, the historical memory of which only a fragment remains to us,[43] or the "golden little work" on meditation. Furthermore, he accommodates himself to it in his exegesis, with his customary concern for clear distinctions.[44] In a passage of the *De arca*, he compares Scripture to the Seraphim of the sixth chapter of Isaiah:

> If, then, the Seraphim signifies the Sacred Scriptures, the three pairs of wings are the ways in which this self-same Scripture is understood, namely, in terms of history, allegory, and tropology. Therefore, these pairs, though double, are separate, because it is separately that they kindle in souls the love of God and neighbor.
>
> The two wings that cover the body of the Seraphim are history, which covers over the mystic understandings with a literal veil. The two wings that extend all the way to the head and the feet of the Lord are allegory. This is because, when we speak of the mysteries of Divine Scripture, we succeed, by an illumination of the mind, in penetrating through to a recognition of divinity itself, which exists before and after all things. . . . The two wings with which the Seraphim do their flying signify tropology, since, after reading Divine Scripture, we are apt to perform good works as a result of our instruction and we are lifted on high by what we might call wings. . . .[45]

And again this is how he expresses himself in the *De meditando:*

> In our reading a triple kind of research is undertaken, in accord, namely, with the dictates of history, allegory, and tropology. This research can be considered historical, when we seek or marvel at an explanation for the things that have happened, in terms of their own time and space. An explanation like this is perfectly suitable in its own way. . . . When the research is allegorical, there is a consideration of the way in which the preceding things have been arranged. This reflection attends to the significance of what will happen in the future, which fits together in a marvelously providential scheme. This is most appropriate, when it comes to building up our understanding and notion of faith. When the research is conducted in terms of tropology, there is a consideration of what fruit the sayings bear, and there is an investigation, too, into what these sayings recommend as needing to be done.[46]

Let us continue with a consideration, for the moment, of the order in which the different senses are presented. This same order is indicated by several passages of the Victorine *Miscellanea*[47] and followed by several disciples of Hugh, including the author of the *Speculum de mysteriis Ecclesiae*,[48] the anonymous writer of the "letter to a friend" on the reading of Holy Scripture,[49] Godfrey of Saint Victor (†1194),[50] and Hugh of Fouilloy.[51] We also find disciples such as Irimbert, the Abbot of Admont (†1177), who speaks of the "fourfold sense of Sacred Scripture,"[52] or "the threefold sense, which is historical, allegorical, and moral."[53] And there are disciples like Adam Scotus (†1186), in both his sermons[54] and the *De Tabernaculo* (ca. 1175),[55] His developing the theme of "the Word of God as sword" affords him the occasion of expressing himself in formulas that are at once explicit and compact:

> When the sword that is the word transfixes the soul, who is up to the task not only of relating, but of comprehending the insights that are revealed? To be sure, there are many insights revealed in many different ways, when the sword that is the word transfixes the soul. It all depends on whether this same sword deals out multiple strokes or a variety of different ones. For it transfixes the soul in frequent and diverse ways as it strikes:
>
> In the first place, the examples shown by the saints are communicated when it strikes, and it transfixes the soul with history. Secondly, the truth of the faith is revealed, and it touches the soul with allegory. Thirdly, morals are built up, and it strikes the soul with tropology.

> Fourthly, the joys of heaven are revealed, and the soul is sweetly smitten by anagogy.
>
> Consider the following questions: Are there not revealed under the guise of history insights that rouse a person to an imitation of sanctity? Are there not insights in allegory that illuminate a person so that he may recognize truth? Are these insights not kindled to a love of virtue by tropology? Do they not melt under the sway of anagogy into a sheer longing for the happiness of heaven?[56]

So, too, argues the author of the *Allegoriae in universam Scripturam*, who is quite likely to have been Adam Scotus himself.[57] This is likewise the order followed by Oger,[58] Guerric of Igny,[59] Serlon of Savigny,[60] Philip of Harvengt (†1183),[61] Baldwin of Canterbury (†1188),[62] Gilbert Foliot,[63] the *Meditatio ad Crucifixum* of the monk of Farne,[64] Peter Comestor,[65] etc. For the *De septem septenis*, "he who faithfully esteems history, allegory, tropology, and anagogy faithfully embraces both the Old and New Testaments."[66] John of Salisbury (†1180) is more explicit in his *Polycraticus:*

> As it happens, I would allow that the pages of the divine books, each of whose letters are full of divine revelations, should be read with such great seriousness precisely because the treasure trove of the Holy Spirit, by whose finger they were written, can never be exhausted. For although the literal surface meaning of these sacred pages may be fitted with only one sense, a teeming swarm of mysteries lies hidden within them. And using this foundation, allegory often builds up faith, while tropology does the same for morals in various ways. Then, too, anagogy leads the way on high in many ways, so as to establish the literal dimension not only through words, but through the very things themselves.[67]

In an *Altercatio Synagogae et Ecclesiae*, dating from the end of the twelfth century, we read the following:

> The doctrine of Christ attracts the young and small with history. It trains older souls with allegory, delicate souls with the moral sense, and contemplative souls with anagogy.[68]

Peter of Poitiers, who in his turn enumerates the four senses, attaches the second or allegorical sense to that "hazy, enigmatic knowledge" which is our lot here below.[69] The same order occurs many times in the work of

Petrus Cellensis (†1183), who is inclined to count only three senses in his sermons: "What is seen lifts up the mind, its significance props the mind up, and wisdom embraces the mind welcomingly. The literal resides in what is seen, allegory in its significance, and the moral sense in the virtue of wisdom."[70] He assumes the same order in his smaller works.[71] We find this order also in Garnier of Rochefort († after 1200), who counts three senses[72] at certain points, and four at other times.[73] Likewise in some anonymous sermons which refer at times to three senses and at other times to four.[74] Werner of Saint Blaise,[75] Saint Martin of Leon (†1203),[76] and the so-called *Sentences of Warsaw*[77] reproduce the common schematic arrangement without originality. The same arrangement is to be found in Peter Cantor (†1197), who applies it — and this is the remarkable thing about it — to Saint Jerome. The saint, he says, "explicated the whole collection of books to Paula and Eustachium historically, allegorically, tropologically, and anagogically."[78] Peter of London proffers a similar explanation in his *Remediarium conversorum* with regard to Saint Gregory: "To the extent, in the preceding books, that a serious historical narrative is communicated and the depths of allegory are discussed, the nature of every kind of moral quality is portrayed."[79] Peter Lombard also adheres to this arrangement in his explication of certain psalms,[80] as does Luke of Mont Cornillon throughout his *Moralitates in Cantica*.[81] The same order obtains in Stephen of Tournai (†1203), in Alan of Lille,[82] in Hildegard's *Liber divinorum operum*,[83] and in the Victorine follower of Dionysius, Thomas of Vercelli (†1245).[84] Lothaire of Segni (Innocent III, †1217) multiplies the didactic expositions of the order in both his sermons[85] and his other works.[86] Adam of Perseigne († ca. 1221) is no less precise in the long letter that he addresses to Robert Poulain, Archbishop of Rouen, around the year 1208:

> There is a fourfold approach to understanding sacred Scripture. The first has to do with history, which is a narrative of deeds that have been done. The second concerns allegory, which is the spiritual significance of these deeds that have been done. The third concerns tropology, which pertains to moral reasoning. The fourth concerns anagogy, which leads the soul upwards.[87]

Their contemporary, Stephen Langton, loves to recall the four "kinds"[88] or four "expository methods"[89] of Scripture in this same order. It is the order that is found yet again in Prevostin of Cremona (†1231),[90] in the *Postillae* of Hugh of Saint Cher, who explains the whole Bible, in principle, at least, according to the four senses,[91] in Guiard of Laon

(†1247),[92] in William of Auvergne (†1249),[93] and in many others. It is the order that would be adopted habitually by most of the great scholastics. It would, moreover, be the order adopted by Nicholas of Lyra, Ockham,[94] Wycliffe,[95] and others. On the threshold of the thirteenth century, Alexandre de Villedieu uses these terms to celebrate the biblical poet Peter of Riga:

> He astonished us by drawing the sweetness of honey from a rock.
> He brought to light significant meaning from simple historical
> narrative, even while adding a measure of morality to them both.[96]

It is well known that medieval symbolism readily encompasses not only Scripture and the visible universe, but that other universe, that other living, sacred book which is divine worship.[97] The Fathers transposed the ancient doctrine that saw the universe at once as a temple and as a body and each temple as being at once the human body and the universe. By virtue of this transposition, the cosmic and liturgical mirrors, while corresponding with each other, also correspond to the mirrors of history and the Bible. The material Church is an image of the perfect Man, being as it is "the geometric projection of the Son of Man on the cross."[98] And, like Solomon's Temple, it is also, if some thought be given to the mystery that is celebrated in the heart of it, an image of the mystical body:

> King Solomon built the temple,
> And the likeness and pattern of these two
> Are Christ and the Church.[99]

What is more, the doctrine not only of mystical understanding in general, but of the four senses in particular, is sometimes extended to the liturgy. In this way, it introduces a stable order and harmonizes the diverse aspects of sacred knowledge by making them participate in the same rhythm, even to the point of incorporating in detail the most artificial allegorisms. Thus, features that might appear aberrant find their place within a single mystery.

The liturgist Robert Paululus (†1184), having just spoken of the four "lessons" that are recounted on the night of the Easter vigil, or at the vigil of Pentecost, shows that they should be the object, respectively, of an historical, allegorical, moral, and anagogical reading.[100] Shortly afterwards, Jean Béleth (†1182) engages in a similar exposition of the four senses with regard to Eastertide.[101] On the brink of the thirteenth century,

Sicard of Cremona (†1215), another liturgist, speaks in his *Mitrale* (ca. 1185) of the "holy order of monks" that meditates on "the fourfold sense of the Scriptures: historical, allegorical, tropological, and anagogical."[102] He himself gives a lengthy exposition of this fourfold sense,[103] transposing terms in order to explain liturgical objects or ceremonies. This is why he discovers a mystical sense as well as a moral sense for the ceremonies governing the dedication of churches, inasmuch as Christ is the Temple of God and so is the Christian.[104] Indeed, this is why to him pontifical vestments seem to have an allegorical significance in terms of the priesthood of Christ and a moral significance in terms of the virtues demanded of the priest who is vested with them.[105] For him the whole Mass is representative of a threefold struggle: the historical struggle of the People of God that is recounted in the Old Testament, Christ's struggle with the devil, which was prefigured by this historical struggle, and finally the moral struggle undertaken by the Christian in the course of his mortal existence, in order to be faithful to Christ, whose member he has become.[106] Furthermore, it can be said that this kind of application scarcely constitutes a transposition of the doctrine of Scriptural senses, because ritual celebration, in its essential aspect, is itself the recollection of a fact of biblical history, and because the act of reading in a liturgical context is the consummate vehicle of spiritual understanding.[107] When Rabanus Maurus wrote his *Clericorum institutio*, was it not in the course of the second book, devoted (like the first) to the liturgy, that he introduced his account of the holy books and their different senses?[108] And when Sicard of Cremona wrote that "Easter is spoken of historically, allegorically, tropologically, anagogically,"[109] doubtless he was thinking first and foremost of the feast of Easter as celebrated in the Church rather than of the texts of Exodus and the Gospels or the events related by these texts. Nevertheless, he was very much like the exegetes, in that what he was driving at essentially was the unique mystery of Easter in its core reality, which had been recorded in the Book and relived in the liturgy.

More remote in its relationship to Scripture than the liturgical application is the cosmic application. What is more, we do not find this application formulated in terms of macrocosm — although Othloh of Saint Emmeran proposes a "threefold understanding"[110] of nature on the basis of sensory observation — but only in terms of microcosm. This is not, though, the microcosm that is the human body, according to the Neoplatonic tradition transmitted by Marius Victorinus, Chalcidius, and Macrobius, and illustrated in the twelfth century by Honorius, Bernard Silvestris, Saint Hildegard, and Alan of Lille.[111] Rather, it is the more rarely con-

sidered microcosm that is constituted by the soul, according to a tradition that has come down from Origen, Saint Augustine, and John Scotus.[112] In reality, therefore, it is the question of an anthropological application. This application presents itself to us in a double form. In a manuscript of *De contemplatione* that Father Baron attributes to Hugh of Saint Victor, as well as in the *De septem septenis*, it is a commentary on the famous injunction to "Know thyself"[113] of the oracle at Delphi. This oracle, given on the tripod of Apollo, recommended a threefold wisdom:

> . . . "Know thyself." The tripod of Apollo: a threefold understanding of wisdom as historical, mystical, and moral. Through history, the external man stoops down to the interior man. Through a mystical understanding, the interior man examines and discusses the secrets of the heart, that is to say, the mind and consciousness. Through a moral understanding he recognizes whence he comes, what he is, and for what reason he exists. . . . In this way, then, wisdom expresses . . . the human condition in a threefold arrangement.[114]

In his *Microcosmus*, Godfrey offers us another form, which is intermediate between the purely anthropological formula and the exegetical formula. He takes up the terms of the latter in order to apply them successively to a study of the three microcosms that he distinguishes: singular, general, and particular. In other words, he applies them to the study, in turn, of human nature (the literal sense), the mystical body of Christ (the mystical or allegorical sense), and every faithful soul (the tropological sense).[115]

5. Inversions

It would probably be possible to extend these lists that bear witness to the two categories we have just examined. Even at this stage, however, a comparison of the lists allows us to see that the most frequent formula is the second one,[1] precisely the one that all too many historians do not take into account. This is the formula that introduces allegory before tropology. It is also the one that provides the basis for the principal theoretical explanations.

Now this difference in order is significant.

It is not as if there were a good reason for this difference to weigh

heavy in either case. If it came to that, we might be dissuaded by the simple fact that one and the same author uses the two orders, by turns, in two different works, or even a few lines apart, without ever attributing any particular intention to the change. Several Fathers of the Church had furnished examples of this, as will be seen in the following chapter. The last of them, Saint Isidore of Seville, enumerates history, tropology, and mysticism in his *Sentences*, while in his *De fide catholica contra Judaeos* he lists history, mysticism, and morality, without, in either case, going beyond a numbering of three, as he does in his *Liber de variis quaestionibus:*

> Divine law should be looked at in three ways. In the first place, let it be understood historically, in the second place, tropologically, and in the third place, mystically. For the historical sense is geared to the letter, the tropological sense is geared to moral science, and the mystical sense is geared to a spiritual understanding, etc.
>
> Inasmuch as the writings of the law must be considered not only historically, but also in accordance with a mystic sense, which is to say, spiritually, etc. Thus, through Solomon Wisdom also says: "Write down the law doubly and trebly in your heart." For the law is perceived doubly. Thus the first perception of it is in terms of history, and then after that it is seen in terms of an understanding of the sacraments. In addition, there is a treble communication of the law, when we find not only an historical or mystical teaching, but also a moral one about how we ought to behave in every circumstance. . . . Let history have its place, and let it welcome the mystical sense, including it in the formation of morals.[2]

The case of Rabanus Maurus (776-856) is particularly important here. On the one hand, to be sure, we are confronted with a writer who lacks profound originality. His most considerable works are huge, colorless compilations.[3] Many pages of his writings are a veritable potpourri. He is not always concerned to harmonize the texts that he collects from all sorts of different sources. Thus, through his eclecticism, the duality of the whole previous Christian tradition is faithfully reflected. On the other hand, he was himself re-read and re-copied by many others. Therefore, it is to him in part that we owe the permanence of that duality which we have just finished establishing as something that obtained throughout the Middle Ages. The passages in which he deals, either explicitly or allusively, with the diverse senses of Scripture, are numerous. Often he adopts the first order, as, for example, in the *De universo* or in the commentary on Leviticus:

> The sum of both Testaments can be distinguished in a threefold way, in terms, that is, of history, morals, and allegory.[4]

> We have often said that in Holy Scripture a triple mode of understanding can be found, namely, the historical, moral, and mystical. For this reason, it is our understanding that body and soul and spirit are contained in it. Here the threefold apparatus of sacrifices shows the threefold form of this understanding.[5]

But much more often he refers to the second order. And in this case he either holds to a tripartite division, as in a passage from his commentary on Maccabees and in a passage from his commentary on Exodus:

> Our Judas . . . does his fighting in orders of three, which are belief in the Holy Trinity or a threefold doctrine, that is to say, one that is historical, allegorical, and tropological.[6]

> It is written that a rope with three strands is hard to break. For surely it is true that Scripture, which has usually been interpreted in an historical, allegorical, and moral sense, is too strong to be ruptured by any distortions of heretics or pagans.[7]

Or else he adds a fourth member, as in other passages from these same two commentaries:

> The holy Doctors give their audience a free and unhampered understanding of the Holy Scriptures. In this way, they make it possible for everyone to acquire, by the grace of God, the means to enter into what they desire to be opened up through their prayerful reading of the Scriptures, whether through allegory, or tropology, or anagogy.[8]

> The words that have been given divine authority are usually perceived through an historical understanding, or an allegorical one, or one that is tropological, that is to say, moral, or else certainly an anagogical understanding.[9]

Keeping our focus on Rabanus Maurus, we can show that the same inconsistency is evident in his commentary on the books of Kings.[10] In the enumeration of senses to be found in his commentary on Ezekiel he

follows the first order at one point and at another point he uses the second. In both passages, though, he simply copies Saint Gregory:

> . . . But since we have spoken of these matters in terms of morals, there still remains the task of investigating the same scheme of things by venturing beyond a figurative understanding.[11]

> For the Words of Sacred Scripture are square stones, because they can stand anywhere, and they are not to be found hemmed in and pressured on any side. For when we look at everything that they tell about the past, and everything that they pronounce about the future, and everything that they preach in terms of morality, and everything that they articulate with regard to spiritual matters, it is as if they stood free on different surfaces, because they have nothing to hem them in and pressure them.[12]

Let us observe, lastly, that in the commentary on the Letter to the Galatians, Rabanus always counts four members, but it is still his practice to adopt by turns each of the two orders. In the case of the second order, he employs it with a variant interpretation, anagogy in this case preceding tropology:

> . . . It is divided into two parts, that is, into historical interpretation and spiritual understanding . . . . There are, moreover, three kinds of spiritual science, namely, tropology, allegory, and anagogy.[13]

> . . . There is history . . . moving on to allegory. . . . there is anagogy . . . and also tropology. . . . Thus the preceding four figures so merge together into one entity, if we want them to, that one and the same Jerusalem can be understood in a fourfold way, historically as the city of the Jews, allegorically as the Church of Christ, anagogically as that celestial city of God which is the mother of us all, and tropologically as the soul of man. . . .[14]

These variations that Rabanus Maurus resorts to find an adequate explanation in the character of his work. Most often he does not do any choosing, but rather he collects the givens of a tradition that he wants to transmit in its entirety. It is clear, however, that he has a preference for the number four. He was in fact a great compiler — not on account of a "flaw" or because of his "impudence," of which he was accused quite unjustly

by William of Malmesbury.[15] Rather, he was a compiler precisely because this is what he had to be, in order to be the great instructor of his country and his age. Nor is he an "intellectual non-entity," as has been said, with a contemptuous disregard that is no less unjust, by a modern historian.[16] His is not at all what could be called a banal mind. He is open to all knowledge. A true humanist, he appreciates the classical authors as well as the Fathers of the Church.[17] He copies the ancient exegetes a great deal, but not always "in a servile manner." In the way that he has of omitting one detail and bending and shifting another, he proves on occasion that he is possessed of a very finely tuned discernment and is quite conscious of his aims.[18] His encyclopedic plan, moreover, did not obviate his concern for integral works, which he sought out with some eagerness. He had a regular and coherent relationship with the best minds of his time, notably the historian Freculph, the bishop of Lisieux. Moreover, he was a cherished disciple of Alcuin and a friend and master of the great scholar Lupus of Ferrières. His friendship extended to the learned and masterful poet Walafrid Strabo, not to mention Otfried of Weissenburg, whose *Book of the Gospels*, written in Old German, combines the qualities of epic, lyric, and didactic poetry. All in all, he is in his own way a pioneer. It is an error to portray him, as has been done recently, as a "narrow traditionalist." He gathers all that he can in the way of sacred and profane wisdom, so as to shake the mental "torpor" of his contemporaries, overcome their barbaric superstitions, and prepare the way for a better future.[19] In addition to this, he is also a poet. It is to him, it seems, that we owe the *Veni Creator*, one of the most beautiful hymns in our liturgy. He is not, however, a poet in the usual sense, through the originality of his workmanship or the harmony of his verse, or by the charm of his images. Rather, he is a poet through the power and strength of a vision of the world that can best be described as level-headed.

At this point, let us broach that strange poem in hexameter verse which is the *De laudibus sanctae crucis.* Rabanus had composed it in his youth, at the instigation of his master Alcuin and his schoolfellow Hatto. It is clear that he attributed no small importance to the work. This can be seen from the way that he speaks about it, as well as the care that he takes to illuminate it and give it rich trappings and then to send it to the main personages of the period. The poem is modelled after a very ancient genre, the genre of "calligrams" or "shaped verses," some examples of which can already be found in the Greek anthology. This genre (which was to be restored to a position of honor in the sixteenth century[20]) had flourished during the Hellenistic age. It had been cultivated skillfully by

a court poet and friend of Constantine, Publius Optatian Porphyry, who set down his verses in a colored framework.[21] Fortunatus imitated Porphyry. Cultured Englishmen admired him, and Carolingians were infatuated with him.[22] Even Rabanus himself referred expressly to him.[23] So we see that his *De laudibus* was in the style of the day. If it is regarded from a strictly literary point of view, it is not, in its heavy-handed cleverness, a masterpiece. And if we looked only at its form, we would merely see a grotesque and ponderous imitation of "those dangerous words in the shape of a diamond, or a flight of stairs, or a criss-cross, or a star, or an altar, or a double and triple cross,"[24] or in the shape of a pyramid or a vessel. Contriving these forms might have been amusing, but "the fact that they were the fashion," writes Father de Ghellinck, somewhat intemperately, "throws an ominous shadow on the literary tastes of the era."[25] It is therefore understandable that, unlike Hugh of Fleury, who recalls only this work by Rabanus Maurus,[26] neither Rémy de Gourmont, nor Maurice Hélin, nor F. J. E. Raby, nor M. L. W. Laistner[27] accords it a mention. It is clear why Father de Ghellinck does not approve of its "extraordinary success,"[28] or why H. O. Taylor is sensitive only to its virtuosity.[29] In any case, nowhere else do we encounter such a sustained application of the genre. Similarly, nowhere else do we find a more striking affirmation of such a robust and triumphantly fervent faith than in this poem, which belongs to a genre that appears tailor-made to express vain thoughts or to commemorate ephemeral solemnities. And this conjunction of form and content is not unpleasant, inasmuch as nothing lends itself better than this massive architecture, this "four-square order" adopted by Rabanus for his "shaped poetry,"[30] to a celebration of the idea that the cross of him "who holds all in all" has taken possession of the universe.

Such a poem is "more singular than useful," declared Dom Ceillier,[31] thereby proving that in the eighteenth century, as in the ninth, a great Benedictine could be prey to the fads of his time. "Nothing in the world is less poetic," said a contemporary of Dom Ceillier. "It is merely insipid prose yoked to a certain number of syllables."[32] And one cannot help feeling that through the superficial exactitude of a judgment like this all great poetry, too, stands condemned in the name of an analytical ideal of gracefulness and charm, a worthy sibling to the normative standards of utility. In the last century, moreover, A. Ebert described it as "a work that is as extraordinarily artificial and laborious as it is wanting in poetry."[33] More ancient readers made declarations of an opposite nature, following Saint Odilo of Cluny, who said that this poem is "more precious to see,

more pleasant to read, more sweet to the memory than anything else that could ever be found, although it was also more difficult to compose."[34] With Sigebert of Gembloux, they admired "its marvelous variety."[35] With Vincent of Beauvais, they considered its author "second to none of the poets of his time."[36] To be sure, if a just appreciation of the work is to be arrived at, the conditions of the time should be taken into account. Certainly a person would not be capable of recognizing the type of beauty that characterizes it, if he remained insensible to the purpose that inspired it. That is why we should reflect on the allusion that Rabanus makes to Lucretius in his preface.[37] It signals a lofty ambition, which itself presupposes a lofty mode of thinking. This Christian, who undertakes a new kind of *De natura rerum*, has achieved a profound realization of the cosmic dimensions of his faith. He wants to show forth a universe that has been entirely taken up by Christ and recreated in this same Christ. He sings of the universal Christ, the Alpha and Omega. His poem comes to be added as a new strophe to the immense poem that was centuries unfolding, namely, the Christian *transposition* of ancient thought and poetry as effected by the Fathers of the Church. He plants the Cross of Christ at the center of everything, just as Virgil placed Orpheus in the middle of the cosmic cup.[38] Time and space, heaven and earth, angels and men, the Old Testament and the New, the physical universe and the moral universe, nature and grace: everything is encompassed, bound together, formed, "structured," and unified by this Cross, even as everything is dominated by it.[39]

Without stopping to examine the complexities and the ways in which the minute details enhance the symbolism involved, let us spare a glance, at least, at those twenty-eight great figures that are square or inscribed in a square. Through them Rabanus celebrates the cross with its four sections, "for it makes everything bright with its brightness."[40] Already in the preface a pattern is evident, since, with its thirty-six verses each with thirty-six letters, it forms a first square and as such is perfect.[41] We should note the insistence with which he enumerates the diverse aspects of the universe that are answerable to the number four. He gathers them all together "from the four regions of the world and time's four seasonal changes" and shows them all to be "ordered and sanctified" in the Cross of Christ.[42] Let us hearken to him as he sings about the sacred perfection of this number, which all beings have venerated ever since it was transfigured through the Cross.[43] Let us listen, too, while he explains again in prose, by dint of a process which was quite fashionable at that time,[44] precisely those points that he was about to discuss in verse. At this stage,

we are struck inevitably by the conviction that the young monk who conceived and constructed a work like this did not give himself over to some awkward edifice of pious fancies. Nor is it true that he yielded to some literary craze. His was the voice of an entire age, an age which, in its robust enthusiasm and its search for fullness and wholeness in every domain, had a predilection for "the four-square order":[45]

> Behold the four-square world with its distinct parts,
> See how it shows that the sign of faith upholds everything.[46]

To take Rabanus at his own estimation, we would not suspect that he had written anything more than diminutive "little works," "little commentaries," and "little explanations."[47] The somewhat affected modesty of these protestations notwithstanding, he must be reckoned as a man who possessed a kind of well-set, foursquare genius. Not unlike his "four-square poems," not unlike that "foursquare world" which he never ceases contemplating or those "foursquare stones" with which he sees himself building the heavenly Jerusalem, he is himself, in a spiritual sense, a "foursquare man."[48]

The case of someone like Saint Bernard seems no less significant. But if we observe the same variety of orders in his work as we do in the work of Rabanus Maurus, the reason for it is almost the opposite. In these two men, the genius of the two medieval renaissances is exemplified. It is a genius that is at once alike and opposite, and, what is more, it is alike even while it is opposite. Less cosmic and more interior, Bernard makes successive use of two frameworks that are offered to him by tradition, and infuses two aspects of his own thought into them. Without a doubt, his thought is quite traditional, but at the same time it is very richly personal, as pliant and subtle as that of the Archbishop of Mainz was massively solid. In a certain number of his sermons he holds to the classical order: history, allegory, and morality.[49] In some other sermons, to the contrary, the sequence is: history, morality, and the mystical.[50] A similar observation can be made with regard to certain other figures, who are also to be numbered among the greatest, notably Rupert of Deutz[51] and Richard of Saint Victor. The latter, for example, writes as follows in his *Liber exceptionum*, the complete edition of which Father Jean Châtillon has recently given us:

> Divine Scripture deals with its own matter in a threefold way, namely, historically, allegorically, and tropologically.[52]

He adopts the same schematic arrangement in several sermons,[53] not to mention many passages of his commentaries.[54] He presupposes it in his *De eruditione hominis interioris*.[55] He also writes about it in the *Adnotatio mystica in psalmum 134*:

> After we have investigated history, we should look at morality. Similarly, after morality, we advance towards anagogy by means of our investigation of allegory.[56]

It is this latter order that he also observes in his three sermons for the Feast of the Dedication,[57] in the *Benjamin major*, and, apart from one exception, in the dissertation that forms its appendix, the *Nonnullae allegoriae tabernaculi faederis*,[58] where he discusses the four senses at length.[59]

Hugh himself, whom we have been able to cite as one of the principal witnesses to the second order, adopts the first order at least once.[60] Contrariwise, Abelard adopts the second order at least once.[61] In one and the same chapter, the *Caroline Books* first enumerated allegory, anagogy, and tropology, and then tropology, allegory, and anagogy.[62] In each case, history is presupposed. Rathier of Verona, too, changes his order in the compass of the same paragraph.[63] Gerhoh of Reichersberg (†1169) changes it in the course of his commentary on the psalms.[64] Hugh of Rouen does so in his *Dialogues*.[65] Raoul Ardent does so from one homily to another,[66] while Peter Comestor does so from one sermon to another[67] or within the same sermon.[68] In his commentary on the first Gospel, Anselm of Laon starts methodically, according to "historia," then according to "moralitas," and finally according to "allegoria." But he does not remain faithful to this order right to the end.[69] The Gloss on Exodus gives us one order,[70] while the Gloss on Deuteronomy gives us another.[71] Similar fluctuations can be observed in an explication of the Song of Songs by the Cluniac Gilbert Foliot (†1188).[72] The same is true of the explication of the Song of Songs by Abbot Wolberon of Cologne († c. 1167).[73] In his little work on the Child Jesus, which he manages, incidentally, to convey with great ease and freedom, Aelred of Rievaulx allows "the sweetness of history" to be followed by mystical explications, which form the foundation of a moral explication.[74] This is the reverse of what we discovered in his preaching. In his theoretical expositions, the abbot Absalon always puts tropology in second place. It does not matter whether he counts three senses or four, and whether he places anagogy before allegory or after it.[75] But in his practical exegesis he usually gives the allegorical sense before the moral sense.[76] This is often done by Honorius in his commentary on the Song of

Songs.[77] In a sermon on the Purification of the Virgin, Garnier of Rochefort says: "The Word of God is usually divided into historical, moral, allegorical, and anagogical senses."[78] This is what he says in a sermon for Easter Day, when he makes an allusion to four "passages": "First of all, let us celebrate the historical Easter, then secondly the allegorical Easter, thirdly the tropological Easter, and fourthly the anagogical Easter."[79] It is this second order that he takes up in a sermon for Pentecost[80] and that he maintains when he justifies it in a chapter discourse, although he counts no more than three senses:

> For history is encompassed in the guise of the sense that lies in verbal signs for things . . . allegory is encompassed in the guise of the sense that lies in the orientation of things to mystical facts, and tropology is encompassed in the guise of the sense that lies in things that are significant for the experience of mysticism.[81]

In the following century a similar phenomenon may be seen in the case of somebody like Saint Bonaventure, when he adopts the first order in his *Itinerarium mentis*,[82] the second in his *Breviloquium*[83] and *De reductione artium*,[84] and yet a third order in his *In Hexaemeron*.[85]

In authors like Saint Bernard, Richard of Saint Victor, and Saint Bonaventure, we shall have occasion to see the reason for these variations. In other authors, as we said before, there is often nothing intentional about the variations, and they are merely the traces of an earlier duality that seems no longer to be perceptible. We shall see the origins of it in the following chapter. Even when we look at the first group, the intention of the variation is always very much fitted to the occasion only, and it is doubtless more instinctive than reflected upon. Variations in language can be precipitated by a variation in point of view, without, however, affecting the deeper meaning of the doctrine. But in principle, at the root of the issue, the difference between one order and the other, between one formula and the other, appears to be no less fundamental. It is a sign of intellectual conceptions and orientations that do not entirely share the same source and that are sometimes still distinguished from one another even in later texts. In fact, according to whether the "moral" sense precedes or follows the allegorical sense, that is to say, according to whether it is unrelated to it or dependent on it, it can be something that is very diverse. Since this is so, this diversity can be so great and so radical that it produces two divergent equilibriums of the triple or quadruple sense. Let us also say that, this being the case, if a person holds to the first expression of diver-

gences, only the second of the two orders, the one that puts allegory right after history, expresses authentic doctrine in both its fullness and its purity. It alone gives an adequate rendition of the Christian mystery. It is the one that gives us "the four theological understandings," to use the words of Innocent III.[86] It is thus the order that yields the true formula, the one that is in fact the most frequent. What follows will show this. In order to be concise, we shall call this formula theological, doctrinal, or classical.

It is this second order that we read in the distich of Augustine of Dacia, from which we took our point of departure. It is the order that it will be our principal task to comment on. But in order to resolve the equivocation that results from the fact that the same word, "tropologia," needs to be understood differently according to the place that it occupies, we must first unravel the two original traditions that were associated very early on and that were bound to mingle their waters, as they made their downstream journey through the course of the centuries. This is going to oblige us to make a fresh incursion into an earlier age, that of the Fathers of the Church. "Born in the East," wrote Emile Mâle, "Christian iconography came to us already formed."[87] This is no less true of biblical doctrine, and the former, moreover, was in great part an expression of the latter. For both these subject areas, in their traverse from East to West, and from the third or fourth century to the twelfth century, there was no hiatus, so to speak, in spite of changes of style, which were often considerable. There was never a secret that had been lost and that needed to be rediscovered.

CHAPTER THREE

Patristic Origins

1. Clement of Alexandria?

If certain historians are to be believed, the first person to devise a theory of the fourfold sense would have been Clement of Alexandria. In this case, the twenty-eighth chapter of the first *Stromata* would be the work that contains the exposition of it. This was the opinion, most notably, of K. R. Hagenbach, author of *A History of Christian Doctrine*, which was accepted for some time as authoritative.[1] It was also the opinion held by C. Bigg, whose remarkable work on *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria* can still be read with profit.[2] The idea was taken up again by R. H. Malden[3] and, more recently, with certain modifications, by H. A. Wolfson.[4] Let us attend to these scholars, then, and read Clement's text. Its two essential passages are to be found at the beginning and end of the chapter. The intervening space between the two passages contains an explanation of the nature of true dialectic, the dialectic that allows us to ascend to true wisdom and that is only possible through the Savior:

> Mosaic philosophy is divided into four parts (or aspects or kinds): the first part is historical, while the second part is specifically legal. Both these parts refer to moral teaching. The third part is the liturgical part, which corresponds to the science of nature, while the fourth part, which is above them all, is the theological part and consists of mystic contemplation. According to Plato, this part, which Aristotle calls metaphysical, aims at the truly great mysteries. Dialectic, too, according to Plato in the *Politics*, is a

science that is appropriate for the discovery of the significance of beings, etc.

Therefore, we must understand the purpose of the Law in three (four) ways: (either as showing a "type"), or as manifesting a sign ("sēmeion"), or as giving a precept ("entolēn") for right conduct, or as announcing a prophecy ("prophēteian").

And Clement concludes with the following reflection:

> I am well aware that it is the task of perfect men to discern things and articulate them. For, in order to interpret all of Scripture, you cannot "lump everything together," to use a proverbial expression. Rather, Scripture should be broached in the most dialectical way possible, if one wants to find the coherent result of divine teaching in it.[5]

What Clement says of Scripture can be said of his own text. Whoever seeks to understand it will find it unyielding, if it is approached with the facile simplicity of the proverbial expression that talks in terms of "everything being lumped together." And if there is a need for perfect men to discern the fourfold aspect of Mosaic philosophy and the triple or quadruple purpose of the Law, the discernment of the exact sense that Clement wanted to impart to these distinctions does not seem to be child's play either. The difficulty is further exacerbated, as we shall see, by a problem of textual criticism.

Three questions can be asked under this heading of textual criticism:

1) Does the division at the end of the chapter simply take up the division laid out at the beginning? Is there a parallelism between the different parts of the philosophy of Moses and the different ways of understanding the purpose of the Law? Bigg affirmed that there was. I would be inclined, from the very first, to make the same affirmation as Bigg, if there were an indisputable list with four constituent members on both sides of the equation. In other words, if, in the introduction to the second division, we ought to read the "tetrachōs" rather than "trichōs."[6] But Clement's editors do not agree on this reading, nor, consequently, on the authenticity of the first of the four members that follow: "as showing a type."[7] In point of fact, this short phrase is lacking in the *Laurentianus*, a manuscript of the eleventh century, the only one that has preserved the *Stromata* for us. It appears only in a scholium of Psalm 76, to which Erik Peterson drew attention in 1931.[8] This scholium, which is part of a collec-

tion recently edited by Dom Pitra, contains the whole passage from Clement whose beginning and end we cited above.[9] It is legitimate, however, to ask whether the words "as showing a type" do not constitute a doublet, a gloss that was added to Clement's text by some copyist. This is the opinion recently voiced by H. A. Wolfson, who wishes to see this phrase, "as showing a type," as the exact equivalent of the last member of the series: "as announcing a prophecy." Is not Law-Type the same thing as Law-Prophecy? Is it not always a "prophetic type"? The argument is not fully convincing, and Wolfson himself seems to recognize this when he goes on to espouse a position that hypothesizes its authenticity.[10] It is always a delicate thing to decide on the exact purport of a difficult text according to the way in which it is supposed that the thought of its author should be understood. To the contrary, Peterson's thesis derives much of its force from the fact that, at the beginning of the phrase, the adverb "trichōs," which was adopted by Hervet and then by Stählin in a first edition, is in reality only a conjectural correction, meant to correct an apparent contradiction. Davidson had read "tetrachōs." Bigg defended him against Hervet.[11] Potter and Sylburg hesitated. But Stählin, convinced by Peterson's demonstration, restored "tetrachōs" in a new edition, in 1936. Father Mondésert followed him, although he put the words that are only to be found in Dom Pitra's scholium between square brackets. There is no lack of additional arguments whose aim it is to allow the text given by the scholium to be admitted. To the arguments vented by Peterson can be added the fact that the *Laurentianus* "was written very negligently," that "all kinds of errors are to be noted in it," not to mention "a certain number of small, but probable, lacunas."[12] Also, although he considered the proposed restoration not to be proof against every objection, W. Den Boer said, in 1947, that he understood those who reject Hervet's correction and complete Clement's phrase by the words of the scholium, which ensure its logical equilibrium.[13]

Let us, therefore, admit a concerted parallelism between the two passages that frame chapter 28 of the first *Stromata*. Both of these passages are made up of a series of four. But if the two lists are looked at more closely, it is clear that it is still quite difficult to make them correspond member for member. In fact, a table would look like this:

- History = Types
- Legal Prescriptions = Signs
- Liturgy = Moral Precepts
- Theology = Prophecy

The only correspondence that is somewhat obvious would be that of legal prescriptions to moral precepts; under this hypothesis, liturgical precepts could also be made to correspond to signs. In this case, though, we encounter the drawback that the order from one list to the other does not line up. One could, however, if absolutely necessary, see the "types" that usher in the second list as the historical facts that usher in the first one. But such a supposition is quite fragile. Finally, is it possible to juxtapose "theology" and "prophecy"? Wolfson is persuaded that it is indeed possible, since, he says, prophecy for Clement, as for Saint Paul, concerns the mysteries of Christ, which are the object of theology.[14] This assimilation is somewhat overly hasty, and it appears more than doubtful if reference is made to a phrase of the fourth *Stromata*, where Clement is more inclined to place the two things in opposition: "After a foray into theology," he says by way of transition, "there will be an explanation of what has been transmitted through prophecy."[15] Nevertheless, one could, by way of pure hypothesis, modify the order and establish the following table:

- History = Types
- Legal Prescriptions = Moral Precepts
- Liturgy = Signs
- Theology = Prophecy

2) But is the first of these two lists an enumeration of the Scriptural senses? The matter is very far from being self-evident. In this list Clement draws a parallel, on the one hand, between the philosophy of Moses, which means the content of the Pentateuch (or, by extension, the Bible as a whole), and, on the other hand, profane philosophy, which means the teaching of the Greek schools. The Greek schools, in turn, are usually divided into three parts, following the schema that is said to be Platonic. These are what Clement calls moral doctrine,[16] physical theory,[17] and, depending on the circumstances, metaphysics, dialectic, or theology. An attempt like this at drawing parallels is not without profound significance, and it is this that explains its success in the history of Christian thought. Nevertheless, the artificial character of the comparisons, which are rendered more laborious yet by the fact that the contents of the Pentateuch were divided into four parts and profane philosophy included only three, aptly demonstrates that they were only concocted after the fact.[18] We must, therefore, attempt to discern their purport without looking too closely at the particulars. With all the more reason should we broach and unveil their significance in a serious vein rather than see them as a transformation

of Christian exegesis into philosophical or "mysteric" exegesis. Indeed, the opposite is true. Not only would the assimilation of the Mosaic revelation about God to "the epoptic vision of the great mysteries" be literary, as is the case elsewhere in the work of Clement, but the addition of the adverb "really"[19] seems to indicate an explicit intention, on his part, to make transpositions and contradistinctions.[20] But this is of small importance to the subject with which we are presently dealing. What seems, in any case, to be clear and indeed quite natural is that Clement is intent on recognizing four principal elements in the Pentateuch: history, moral legislation, ritual prescriptions, and doctrine about God. Nevertheless, without denying that these elements can be more or less mixed together — whatever word is chosen to translate the neuter noun that serves to describe the four elements: part, aspect, or genre[21] — he does not say that these four elements can be found superimposed on one another in every text, or even in any given text, any more than any given text of Greek philosophy contains the other parts.

3) The second list remains. Irrespective of whether it has three or four members, does it infer, more than the first list, that each Mosaic text, or at least each prescription of the Law — for at this point Clement does not seem to want to talk about the whole of the Pentateuch — admits of a series of superimposed significances: typical, symbolic, moral, and prophetic? Among other difficulties, let us note that in speaking about the Law and saying that it "gives a prescription for right conduct," Clement cannot possibly be speaking of anything other than a literal sense. In every way, it appears much more natural to suppose that his enumeration is to be understood more or less disjunctively. Indeed, this appears to be a very necessary reading of it, I think, if we take into account the little Greek particle "ē," which is repeated three times and which can only be translated, as does Caster, by "or else" ("sive"), and not by "and." Thus, the "four ways of understanding the purpose of the Law" would not be four ways of understanding the whole law at the same time. The reader would only be invited, in each instance, to discern whether he is in the presence of a moral law, a liturgical and symbolic precept, or a prophecy — without, however, discounting the possibility that this prophecy (or moral law or liturgical symbol) may be "typical."[22]

Strictly speaking, therefore, Clement of Alexandria is very likely not the ancestral source of our hermeneutical doctrine in the precise form that is the object of this study. In this first passage from the *Stromata*, he does not speak of a "non-literal," threefold sense, which would have to be sought under the lineaments of the letter of history. He does not subdivide this

nonliteral or allegorical sense into three kinds or into three tiered layers, as it were — moral, physical, and theological — which, together with the literal sense presupposed as a basis, would yield a fourfold sense.[23] Despite the negative result that we have arrived at, it was not, however, profitless to consider this text of the *Stromata*, because it helps put us on our guard against an improper interpretation of many a similar text — a situation that we shall presently encounter.[24] This exercise has also been useful because, at the very least, we have, by engaging in it, discovered the expression of an idea that would, with some modifications, spread and traverse the centuries, establishing links with the idea of a threefold or fourfold sense: the idea, namely, of a correspondence between the diverse parts or senses of Scripture and the diverse human disciplines.[25]

Another text, preserved by Clement, has been thought of as analogous, or even identical, to the Christian texts on the threefold sense. I am referring to the 66th of the *Selections from Theodotus*:

> At first, the Savior taught the Apostles figuratively and mysteriously, secondly in parables and riddles, and then thirdly and finally, in a clear and direct fashion, when they were alone.[26]

According to Bigg, Theodotus speaks, therefore, "of three senses, the Literal, the Parabolic, and the Mystical, just as Origen does, but finds them only in the New Testament."[27] In reality, this restriction to the New Testament alone does not constitute the sole difference. There are other differences, more fundamental ones. Theodotus is not talking about all the writings of the New Testament, nor even about the regular text of the Gospels, but only about the Savior's teachings to his Apostles, regardless of whether they were committed to writing or not, or whether they are known to us or not. Besides, the order is inverse to the one given by Bigg, and the sense that Bigg calls "literal" is far from being the obvious exterior sense in the work of Theodotus, the sense that everyone understands, but that must in due course be left behind. On the contrary, the literal sense in Theodotus is the profound sense, the one that yields truth, the final explanation, which is unveiled privately and to intimate friends alone, of the things that the multitude understands only figuratively or in terms of parables.[28] What is more, "parables and riddles" do not appear to constitute a second sense. This is evident when we look at texts that in terms of a first sense would first and foremost have only been "figures and mysteries." Finally, it is clear that, if the last sense, which is provided by "clear and direct" explanation, conceals the first two, it is added to them less in

terms of a deeper degree of comprehension than as something that suppresses them, inasmuch as figures and parables do not by themselves have reality apart from language. In short, there is no question here of "different senses of Holy Scripture." This gnostic text has no truly founded relationship with the doctrine of the threefold sense.

2. Saint Augustine?

A much more ancient opinion attributes the doctrine of the four senses, in its most classic expression, principally to Saint Augustine. This is largely based upon a misunderstanding that is similar to the one that we believe entered into play in Clement's text. The line of argument is not without its merits, however. There are two passages from Augustine's works that ought to be examined more closely, since they have often been alluded to in this connection.

The first passage can be read in the *De utilitate credendi:*

> Therefore all of that part of Scripture that is called the Old Testament is communicated in the following fourfold way to those who are eager to know it thoroughly: historically, etiologically, analogically, and allegorically . . . . Etiologically, when the reason is shown for its being said or done. Analogically, when it is demonstrated that the two Testaments, the Old and the New, are not opposed to each other. Allegorically, when it is taught that certain texts that are written are not to be accepted literally, but are rather to be understood figuratively.
>
> Our Lord Jesus Christ and His Apostles used all these ways. . . .[1]

In spite of the illustrative examples and commentaries that ensue,[2] the interpretation of these lines is not easy. Augustine himself seems not to feel entirely at ease with a borrowed vocabulary, one that he does not dare, as he says, to take upon himself to modify.[3] What is more, we must take into account the particular perspective that is his. For Augustine, everything is envisaged in terms of the Manichaean controversy. As much as anything else, the four modes that are enumerated are means of circumventing the objections which the disciples of Mani were raising against the Old Testament. Theologians who refer to them can see very clearly that they do not correspond, word for word, to their fourfold formula. The matter is plain enough. Generally they must also admit that,

for the first three terms at the very least, there was no question, in the thought of Saint Augustine, of three superimposed senses, that is to say, of three layers of significance in one Scriptural text. Rather — in a way similar to what we have seen in the work of Clement — we have three genres of text, each one of which demanded a particular kind of explication.[4] Unless, we should add — although the nuance is of little importance — "aetiologia" and "analogia" are not, properly speaking, senses at all, but considerations by which the exegete justifies the (historical) sense of a given text, either by indicating its cause,[5] or by showing its agreement with another text, a text from the other Testament, to be more precise.[6] Nevertheless, these theologians strove afterward to find some way to reduce the Augustinian list to the list that had meanwhile become classic, so as to place the latter list under the aegis of the former. To this end, they construed the first three terms distinguished by Saint Augustine as three varieties of the literal sense alone and the fourth term as the genre that encompasses their three spiritual senses (allegory, tropology, anagogy). This is the way, for example, that Alonso Tostado proceeded in the fifteenth century, recapitulating a tradition that was already long-standing.[7] It is also the path of Sixtus of Siena in his *Bibliotheca sancta*, where, to ground his interpretation, he refers to a passage from the *De vera religione*.[8] As early as Alexander of Hales, we find a similar way of proceeding:

> The first three senses are understood and comprehended under the heading of the literal sense . . . . The fourth sense, however, comprehends the three spiritual senses.[9]

Saint Thomas made the same sort of approach to the problem:

> The three of them, history, etiology, and analogy pertain to one literal sense . . . . And allegory alone takes its place among those four as representing the three spiritual senses.[10]

There is, to be sure, a difficulty. It can, in fact, be asked what justification there is, in an enumeration that is so apparently homogeneous, for handling the fourth term separately in this way. Why would "allegoria" here necessarily be a sense superimposed on "historia" any more so than "aetiologia" or "analogia"? Does it not seem rather that "allegoria" also alludes to a certain category of texts — "certain texts"[11] — those that should be understood, as Augustine says himself, not "literally," but "figuratively"?[12] In this case, the four ways in which Scripture is, in the words

of Saint Augustine, communicated or explained to those who want to make an applied study of it would all have a similar relationship to its literal sense such as this literal sense is understood when it is distinguished from the three other senses in the classical formula. This opinion, which runs counter to the thinking of Saint Thomas, was held by Thomas's schoolfellow, Ulrich of Strasburg, who explains that: "Augustine divides the literal sense in four."[13]

However, it is not by any means certain that Ulrich is right. It is worthwhile for us to recall Augustine's dominant concern, which is to defend the holiness of the Old Testament against a prejudicial inclination to condemn it. "Allegoria" contributes to this defense by discovering "great secrets" beneath the literal surface of certain texts: "figurative secrets that are so great that every explanation that is adduced compels those who want to condemn these notions, before they have even ventured to learn about them, to confess that they are woefully wrong."[14] Now in certain cases, at least, the secret that is discovered by "allegoria" is a sense which harmonizes the Old Testament with the New. This is very much the case in terms of the examples that are proposed. These include the words of Jesus in the Gospel of Saint Matthew: "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so will the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Matt. 12:40). There is also the chapter from 1 Corinthians in which Saint Paul applies the Exodus narratives to Christians.[15] But in facilitating the linkage of one fact to another in each of these two Testaments, "allegoria" could only be made amenable to the literal sense by being confounded with "analogia," "which is the means by which harmony between the two Testaments is examined and explored."[16] As a result, Saint Augustine's division would not be adequate. This, though, does not happen. In the examples that are cited, it is not a question, on the one hand, of pure figures, in the grammatical sense: neither the fact of Jonah nor the events of the Red Sea and the desert are placed in doubt. On the other hand, their linkage with the realities of the New Testament is assured only if an "allegorical" sense is superimposed on the historical or literal sense of the texts that report them. This is why, moreover, we have the difference with "analogia," which only establishes a relationship between two texts understood simply in their literal dimension.[17] Except, it must be acknowledged, these are merely examples, and Augustine's manner of speaking, here as in other places, allows for the supposition that it need not always be this way. "Allegoria" can quite as easily, in other instances, admit of no allusion to the link between the two Testaments. In this case, "allegoria" is that metaphorical

or "figurative" sense which excludes all understanding of the text that is "of a literal kind"[18] and even clashes with the literal sense, to use terminology which did not belong to Saint Augustine, but rather to Saint Thomas. In reality, then, neither Ulrich of Strasburg nor Saint Thomas is entirely right. What we have in this rendition of "allegoria" as found in the *De utilitate credendi* is something ambiguous. It does not correspond either fully or exclusively to any of the kinds of understanding which would eventually be distinguished — or which were already distinguished in another way. Among the four "modi" that Saint Augustine enumerates here, we must combine "analogia" and "allegoria" together in order to obtain Christian allegory.[19]

It seems to me that this interpretation is confirmed by a doublet that can be found in the *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber* — a work which was also directed against the Manichaeans and which includes another example:

> . . . There are four ways of explaining the Law that are conveyed by certain students of the Scriptures. The names of these four ways can be articulated in Greek and defined and explicated in Latin: historically, allegorically, analogically, and etiologically. History is when a deed that has been done on the part of either God or man is recounted. Allegory is when the words are understood figuratively. Analogy is when harmonious agreement between the Old and New Testaments is shown. Etiology is when the causes of the words and deeds are rendered.
>
> Therefore, of that which is written, namely, that "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," it can be asked whether it is to be understood only just historically or whether any of it has figurative significance, and how it is congruent with the Gospel, and why in this case that book is incomplete. . . .[20]

The theologians who found a way of accommodating the passage from the *De utilitate credendi* to the theory of the fourfold sense found themselves in conflict with this text from the very beginning, for they saw it as an objection. Their explanations come across as a relatively late exercise in harmonization. Theirs is a desire to show that, in the final analysis, the four senses of this passage, even though they appear to be "discordant" with the four classical senses, "amount to the same thing."[21] It is not the same story when we come to a second text, which figures right at the beginning of the *De Genesi ad litteram.* Initially, this text was invoked as

an authority — even though its claims to playing a corroborative role in the question were not any more solid. Concerning the first verse of Genesis, Augustine engages in the following reflection:

> In all the holy books one must consider what matters of eternal signficance are being communicated, what deeds are being recounted, what future events are being foretold, and what actions are being counselled or advised.[22]

Without hesitation Bede recognizes here "the fourfold reasoning process" according to which every word of Scripture is customarily understood.[23] In the wake of Bede, Rabanus Maurus reproduces Augustine's text,[24] which thereby reaches Saint Thomas. The latter also wanted to see it as referring to the four traditional senses.[25] Other theologians would cite it yet again, without any further critical concern.[26] There is here, in fact, unlike the case of the *De utilitate credendi*, a manifest external correspondence with the fourfold sense (except that anagogy comes first): after history comes allegory, which may be described as "the foretelling of future events," followed by tropology, in regular fashion. There is, however, no doubt at all here either that Augustine's thinking is of another kind. He wants to indicate the four sorts of subjects that the Bible deals with by turns, the diverse and diversely apportioned matter of its teachings — without, however, excluding the notion that one of these subjects that the Bible deals with might be the announcement of "future events" and that this announcement may often take place by way of facts and figurative events.[27] This is what Dominic of the Trinity may be credited with recognizing in the seventeenth century.[28] As for more recent theologians, including Perrone,[29] their reservations regarding the fourfold sense served naturally to sharpen their perspicacity.

Let us say right at the outset that the texts of Clement of Alexandria and Saint Augustine that we have just examined are not exceptions. Many other texts that first appearances would incline us to accept do not in reality pertain to our subject. When the author of the *Liber quaestionum*, for example, writes that "there is one name for the Law, although it is understood in a threefold way,"[30] this simply indicates that there are three kinds of precepts in the Law. The four "styles of discourse"[31] that Junilius the African counts in Scripture are also four series of texts, "for they can be either historical, or prophetic, or proverbial, or simply didactic."[32] The same would be said of the three "modi" distinguished by Boethius.[33] No longer would a theory of the biblical senses be sought in the tenth chapter

of the *De institutione divinarum litterarum* by Cassiodorus, which is entitled "on the six ways of understanding."[34] Here no equivocation is possible. What is at issue is a six-point method for studying the Bible, the first point consisting of the reading of authorized introductions and the sixth consisting of consultation with educated elders.[35] The "threefold approach"[36] to the understanding of Scripture that an Irish author of the seventh century explains in the *Liber de ordine creaturarum* is also merely a division of texts into three categories:

1) those that should be taken "only literally without any figurative purpose,"[37] such as certain accounts in the Acts of the Apostles;
2) those that, contrariwise, have only a figurative sense, such as the beginning and the end of the book of Ezekiel, or the parables in the Gospels;
3) and finally those texts, such as the ones dealing with Noah's Ark and the Tabernacle, where "there is an understanding of the text through a sound historical account of things and through a mystic reasoning."[38]

And it was by using the texts from this third group that our author also entered into an explanation of the threefold sense. As much must be said of "the threefold mode of understanding" that Saint Isidore of Seville speaks about in the second book of the *Differentiae*[39] and that the prudent reader should know how to discern, according to what is said in the *Libri carolini*.[40] Claudius of Turin makes a similar division of the prophetical texts into three groups only the last of which includes two superimposed senses:

> Therefore the eloquent sayings of the prophets are found to be tripartite, since it happens that some of them are oriented to the earthly Jerusalem, some to the heavenly Jerusalem, and some to both of these.[41]

And there is nothing unusual about this division. Similarly, Abelard does not speak of a threefold sense, when he writes that "The doctrine of the Old Testament as well as the New is tripartite."[42] Abelard finds a "threefold discipline" in the New Testament itself.[43] Nor does Raoul of Saint Germer speak of a fourfold sense when he takes up almost word for word, in the wake of others, the fourfold division of Junilius.[44] Nor does Honorius speak of a fivefold sense when he enumerates "five different

modes" that can be found in Scripture: history alone, history and allegory together, prophecy alone, the literal alone, and allegory alone — adding that all these modes are attested to in the book of Psalms.[45] And despite the very word "senses," it is not a question of senses as we understand them in the chapter of William of Auvergne's *De legibus*, the title of which reads: "An accurate explanation of the four non-literal senses and their occurrence in four modes."[46]

Nevertheless, if we are not ourselves to be unfaithful to this history, we must observe that the boundary line between these two types of divisions was not always very clearly marked out. That is why Rabanus Maurus, who, as we have seen, so often expounds the doctrine of the triple or fourfold sense, does not seem to have been conscious of speaking about anything else when, in his commentary on Exodus, he wrote:

> In the realm of sacred eloquence there is a great range of difference in the way that things are understood. For it often happens that in certain parts of it both history and allegory enter into play. And it often happens that in certain parts only allegory should be sought, while at other times only history is to be understood. But in some places . . . both history and allegory must be understood at one and the same time. This is so that those who are slower may be nourished by history and those who are quicker intellectually may be nourished by allegory.[47]

In truth he was indeed not speaking about anything else. In one exposition he included the different kinds of texts and the different senses of the text. The observation holds just as true for Isidore of Seville and Claudius of Turin. It holds true for all those who would one day take up the same exposition, in identical or analogous terms, men such as John of Fécamp,[48] Hugh of Saint Victor,[49] and Philip of Harvengt.[50] Into the same category falls Honorius, who gives a precise example for each category of text,[51] as does the *Glossa ordinaria* repeatedly.[52] Of the same camp is the author of the *Allegoriae*, who, after having explained each of the four senses, writes:

> Therefore, since it is established that these four understandings reveal every secret which is in Scripture, we must consider when it needs to be understood according to only one of these understandings, when it needs to be understood according to two of them, when it needs to be understood according to three of them, and when also it needs to be understood according to all four of them at once.[53]

It is this passage from one idea to the other, or this constant mixing of the two, which, as we saw in the preceding chapter, permitted Angelome of Luxeuil to bend and shape the seven "modi" of Primasius in such a way as to denote the seven "sensus." The very definition that is often given of tropology or analogy indicates this passage or mixing: a definition that is taken solely from the object, which can be clearly denoted by the literal sense itself as well as being signified, using the literal sense as a point of departure. Was it not Rabanus Maurus, so used to dealing with the four senses, who spoke of "Tropology, that is to say, a moral mode of discourse, whether it is voiced in unveiled or figurative words"?[54] Others spoke in similar terms of the fourth sense: "Anagogy is when the rewards of life in heaven are discussed in either unveiled or figurative words."[55] In addition, the authors whom we have just cited, as well as those like them, depend, either directly or indirectly, on Saint Gregory the Great, who wrote as follows in the very treatise that he devoted to the threefold sense:

> It should be known that we touch on certain aspects by way of historical exposition and that we examine certain aspects by an investigation of types through allegory. We discuss certain aspects through the tools of allegorical morality alone. And there are some things that we examine more carefully, using all these ways at once, conducting our investigation in a threefold manner.[56]

Without a doubt, Saint Isidore of Seville's *Liber de variis quaestionibus*, by virtue of its eclectic character, offers a curious mix of differentiation and assimilation of the two cases. What can be seen there clearly differentiated are, in the first place, a certain division of Scripture into three parts and then another division into three modes. Except that, if there is no equivocation on the subject of "partes," the given examples of which are entire books, namely, Genesis, Proverbs, and the Song of Songs, Isidore's concept of "modi" appears to be hazier and more blurred. On the one hand, in fact, we learn that there are three "modi" to be found in Scripture: history, figures, and prophecy, signifying three kinds of texts. The first kind have no sense beyond the literal. The second, in addition, take on an allegorical significance that is realized in Christ and the Church. And finally, the third kind are like the first in that they admit of only one sense, although this time it is an utterly spiritual sense. This is what the *Differentiae* set about explaining under the heading of "a trimodal kind of understanding."[57] In this case, these three "modes" that are distributed

throughout Scripture are quite close to its three "parts," although they are excerpted from it according to another criterion. But here we have Isidore, on the other hand, proceeding to point out that certain authors make a distinction, in their understanding of the Holy Books, between four, not three, "modes." Isidore acknowledges these four modes as being the literal, the tropological, the allegorical, and the anagogical modes. From that point the "modi" no longer have anything in common with the "partes." They are identified with the "sensus" and are able to be concerned with the same text. Finally, for a full measure of confusion, the same analogy that was established with the three categories of profane science, namely, physics, ethics, and logic, after having been applied to the three parts of Scripture, is now applied to its four "modes," that is to say, to its four senses.[58]

Presently we must look into things more deeply and return afterward to the question at hand, which includes more than one aspect. But as it stands at the moment, this parenthesis has served to make us understand that the medieval mind would not have placed a gulf between the diverse interpretations of the two Augustinian texts. Medieval man was capable of passing easily from one interpretation to the other. For if it was very much the case that there were two distinct problems involved here, these problems were interwoven with one another. This stands out, moreover, in the way in which, for example, the *Summa* of Alexander of Hales was expressed. In his desire to prove that "the mode of Scripture" is "manifold,"[59] Alexander at once inferred the "four senses" and the diverse genres that can be found in the diverse books of the Old and New Testaments.[60] But the exact significance that should be attributed to the two texts of Augustine taken in themselves is of little importance to our present point of view. Suffice it to say that one of them, at least, contributed in fact to the formation, or the crystallization rather, of the medieval doctrine that we have to describe. The didactic appeal of this "fourfold exegetical scheme"[61] and the clarity of the way in which it was articulated made it suitable for this purpose. As for the essential heart of things, it can be extracted from other passages scattered throughout the work of Saint Augustine. Dominic of the Trinity is right to cite the *De vera religione:*

> Let us distinguish . . . what the mode of interpreting allegory is, for it is believed to have been given utterance through the wisdom of the Holy Spirit. Does it suffice to trace the import of allegory from the visible realm of things that are more ancient to the visible realm

> of things that are more recent, or even to the realm of the affections and nature of the soul, or, indeed, all the way to the domain of an unchangeable eternity? Do some allegories signify visible deeds, others spiritual emotions, and still others the law of eternity? Or can we find some allegories in which all these things are to be discerned?[62]

We shall have occasion to look at other passages. Besides, Augustine is merely working an earlier seam of Christian thought with all the resources of his exuberant genius. And if we find, in his work, that formulas which are at once precise and more or less complete are a rarity — or else, as we have just seen, that they are deceptive — his great disciple, Pope Saint Gregory, felt obliged to undertake the job of providing them in abundance.

3. Gregory, Cassian, and Eucher

Following a line of thought similar to that of Augustine, Gregory puts "research according to types" or "significance according to types"[1] immediately after "historical explanation."[2] Over "the historical foundations" he raises "the spiritual understanding of allegory," in order to arrive at "the loveliness of morality" or "a speculative understanding."[3] Using these three stages of exegesis as his point of departure, he multiplies his comments and explanations. Almost always — although there are a few exceptions[4] — he remains faithful to the following order:

> Since we have gone through the mysteries of allegory, explaining them one by one, let us now touch on morality quite briefly and describe how it should be understood.[5]

Or yet again we find him explaining:

> We are making a brief examination of these matters that fall under the heading of a mystical understanding. . . . The task that remains for us yet is to conduct a moral inquiry into the worth of the senses.[6]

It is apparent that in his eyes this order is very much more than just a convenient means of classification: it is a veritable concatenation where each term has its place, a place that is not interchangeable, which permits him to draw from the biblical text a spiritual teaching that is vigorously

sustained by doctrine.[7] He himself has an explanation for it in his covering letter for the *Moralia in Job*, a letter that is a kind of methodological manifesto:

> . . . the intention being not only to examine the historical words through the allegorical senses, but to apply the allegorical senses directly to the exercise of morality.[8]

In these as in similar texts, Gregory explicitly proposes only three senses. It so happens that he divides the third sense in two in a way that is scarcely apparent. Thus, in the preface to his commentary on the first book of Kings, he says:

> Since it is pleasant as regards its literal surface, quite profound in its allegorical types, useful in its moral instruction, and clear in the examples that it supplies — it makes historical assertions, makes known things that reveal types, *contributes moral observations, and proposes examples to which one might have recourse,* although, by the grace of God, I am going to explain certain matters under the guiding rubric of one of these understandings and other matters under the guiding rubric of several of them.[9]

But it sometimes happens that he effects a real twofold division. In that case, the moral sense is followed by a deeper sense, the sense that is attained in contemplation, which raises the soul to things that come from above,[10] and which can be called the spiritual sense par excellence. At this point, to be sure, we have an equivalent to the anagogical sense. This being the case, we have the formula of the fourfold sense in its completeness:

> And, in fact, the Words of Sacred Scripture are the four end-stones of a square. . . . For in everything that they tell of the past, in everything that they pronounce about the future, in everything that they preach by way of morals, in everything that they proclaim spiritually, they flawlessly portray a kind of condition, as it were, on each of the different sides.[11]

Paul the Deacon, in his *Life* of Saint Gregory, and Notker the Stammerer, in his Summary of the commentators on Divine Scripture, are therefore both right, inasmuch as both of them present Gregory's exegesis as something that unfolds within the context of a triple register, although

each of them presents it in an order that is apparently inverted. Gregory, says Paul the Deacon, turns to the Book of Job and teaches

> how it should be understood literally, in what way it should be referred to the sacraments of Christ and his Church, and with which sense it should be adapted to each one of the faithful.[12]

And Notker says that Gregory explicated this book

> in such a way that he erected the edifice of morality on the foundations of history, and topped it off with the extraordinary pinnacle of anagogy.[13]

What we have here are two incomplete formulas that can nonetheless be completed by one another, in order to demonstrate to us that Saint Gregory was one of the principal initiators and one of the greatest patrons of the medieval doctrine of the fourfold sense.[14]

Of the two formulas by which this doctrine was expressed and which were discerned in the preceding chapter, it is thus the classical formula, the one whose order reproduces the internal logic of the Christian mystery, that finds its initiator in the person of Saint Gregory, the groundwork having been laid by Saint Augustine. The essential link was already encountered in the commentary by Aponius (5th century) on the Song of Songs. Once he had extracted the dogmatic element represented by his text, Aponius passed on to its moral application:

> Thus were foretold those events that we recognize as having achieved their consummation in the burial of the Lord. . . . But, more broadly, these matters should bear reference to the soul, that is to say, to the moral sense.[15]

But, toward the end of Christian antiquity in the West, the other formula, too, did not lack memorable testimonials. Two of them merit particular attention: one to be found in John Cassian's famous *Collationes*, the other in Saint Eucher's *Formulae spiritalis intelligentiae.* Both of these works were very widely read.[16]

In the third chapter of the eighth conference, Abbot Serenus or Cassian, who compares the Scriptures to a fertile field, divides up its productions into four lots. Certain texts, he says, have no need for an interpretation that is loftier than their immediate literal significance (ex-

ample: "The Lord our God is one Lord"). Certain others should be understood in a quite allegorical sense ("Let your loins be girded and your lamps be burning"). Some are to be taken both literally and allegorically at the same time ("If anyone strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also"). Others, finally, in their historical simplicity, help the least capable readers, each according to their situation and capacity, to be strengthened in their tasks as beginners. . . .[17] The point of alluding to this passage here is the analogy that it provides with the passage in *De Genesi ad litteram* in which Saint Augustine made a similar distinction, although he followed a different schema, consisting of four series or four kinds of texts.[18] The difference is that Cassian's perspective is much more foreshortened and restricted. In spite of certain habits of speech that could foster the illusion of his doing so, he does not, in reality, envisage the whole of Scripture nor the totality of its message. He holds fast — and his examples show this — to the teachings and maxims which should directly inspire the Christian consciousness.

In the eighth chapter of the fourteenth Conference, the first conference by Abbot Nesteros, which is devoted to "spiritual science," we find the passage which ought, on the other hand, to restrain us. All human discipline, says the abbot, has its rules, and they can only be mastered if one is constrained to follow a certain order. This holds true for the discipline of our religion, which tends to the contemplation of sacred mysteries: "it subsists in a sure, rational order."[19] He goes on to make a successive series of distinctions. Sacred science, he explains, is twofold, like profane science: it is practical and speculative. One can only arrive at speculative science after having cultivated practical science, which consists of purity of morals.[20] In other words, in order to understand divine truth, in order to achieve an understanding of it in contemplation, the preliminary condition is the exercise of the virtues. Speculative science itself is divided into two branches. That is to say, an understanding of the Scriptures is broached in two stages: there is "historical interpretation"[21] and then "spiritual understanding."[22] The latter, finally, is subdivided in its turn into three parts: "tropology, allegory, and anagogy."[23] For this reason, we find, on the whole, that four successive kinds of interpretation are required in order to obtain from the Word of God every bit of understanding that it is possible for us here below. Cassian sees all four indicated by the Apostle Paul, who tells the Corinthians that one can speak through "revelation" (= allegory), through "knowledge" (= tropology), through "prophecy" (= anagogy), and through "teaching" (= history).[24]

Let us dispense with this last system of concordance, which is partic-

ularly artificial and which Saint Isidore of Seville takes up, in a very hazy way, in his *Liber de variis quaestionibus*.[25] Let us rather consider the order in which the different senses are enumerated, since Cassian himself places capital importance on the question of order. But this is an illusory statement of principle, for we find that the order changes three times in the course of the chapter. His thinking, too, seems no less variable. The details and the examples that the author adduces do not allow any deception in this regard. In the second part, when he comes to comment on St. Paul's four words and gives a similar text from the Letters for each one of them by way of example, we discover that he is no longer referring to one text with four intertwined senses. Rather, as we find above in the conference of Abbot Serenus, he is speaking of four series of texts. One of them, however, the one that falls under the heading of "revelation," comprises, at the very least, the two senses that encompass what is historical or literal and what is allegorical.[26] About the text of the Apostle that he gives as an example of "teaching" or "history," he writes:

> It reveals the simple order of narrative history, which does not contain a more hidden or veiled understanding except in terms of verbal echoes.[27]

It was not at all like this at the beginning of the chapter. The three branches of spiritual understanding, which itself follows after the historical interpretation, are, indeed, for Abbot Nesteros, successive significations which are donned by the same sacred text in addition to its historical sense. Or rather they are indeed significations which are borne by the same reality which is the point at issue in the same text. But in this context tropology does not come into play after allegory, as it customarily does in the work of Saint Gregory. Rather, it follows immediately on history. It is only in the third spot that allegory takes its place, to be followed in turn by anagogy. Cassian, it is true, soon inverts the terms in the course of his explication.[28] In addition, the reader has trouble finding his bearings. This is doubtless an unconscious wavering, but one which is no less significant for all that. It is reflected in the commentary, where it is not clear whether the essential object of "tropologia" or "moralis explanatio" is the human soul in general or the soul that is properly Christian already, in all its inward history. In other words, it is not clear whether this "tropologia" ought simply to give rise to a natural morality, indeed, a natural psychology and, as it were, a "physics" or a "physiology" of the soul, or whether a doctrine of spiritual life founded on revelation can be expected of it.

What we have here is more than a hesitation on the part of the author or an uncertainty on the part of the reader. There is a real ambiguity. Cassian depends here, as we shall see a little bit further on, on a tradition that is already mixed and tangled. From before his time, the explication of Scripture gave rise at times to a tropology that was more or less profane and at times to a sacred tropology. When tropology came after allegory — and even, sometimes, after anagogy — it was sacred. It depended on faith. When it came before, it was profane — in principle, at least. But it was understood that a Christian author could not rest content with it for long. And that is why we see that Cassian, who first placed tropology right after history, only comments on it in the last instance, as if he meant to render to it all its Christian significance. The fact remains that profane tropology, which would not have its fixed place in Saint Gregory's formula, could have it in Cassian's formula.

On the other hand, whereas Gregory most often enumerates only three senses, Cassian enumerates four. In most cases, it has been said, these numerical variations are of no consequence. This new example demonstrates this to us. Except that — and this is a paradox — the contrast here is opposite to the one that one would expect. For the wholly Christian formula, the one which we have called theological or doctrinal, where tropology holds third place, more normally counts four members, whereas the formula where tropology comes second is logically complete by way of three members. It is, in fact, an imitation of two other threefold divisions, which in themselves have no relationship to the division of the biblical senses, nor, in fact, to any Christian reality whatsoever. One of these divisions concerns philosophy, and the other human nature. This is what a text from Saint Eucher is going to show us.

In fact, the origin of the threefold formula can better be recognized in the works of Saint Eucher, a monk of Lérins, who died as bishop of Lyons in 449, than in the works of Cassian. Although his little work, entitled *Formularum spiritalis intelligentiae ad Uranium liber unus*, is somewhat more recent than the *Conferences*, it is perhaps witness to a more ancient and purer form:

> Thus the body of Sacred Scripture is to be found, as they say, in the letter. The soul resides in the moral sense, which is said to be tropical, and the spirit in a higher understanding, which is called anagogical. This threefold rule of the Scriptures is aptly corroborated by the following confession of the Holy Trinity: "May the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and

> body be kept sound and blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Thess. 5:23)
>
> The wisdom of this world has divided its philosophy into three parts, the physical, ethical, and logical, that is to say, the natural, moral, and rational. But this natural part pertains to the causes of nature, which contains the universe. The moral part is the one which looks to morals. And the rational part, moreover, is the one which discusses higher matters and confirms that God is the father of all things. That dialectical distinction of ours by which all of the learned suppose that this heavenly Philosophy of the Scriptures should be discussed historically, tropologically, and anagogically is not therefore incongruent with this threefold way in which teaching is arranged. Wherefore history impresses on us the truth of deeds and the credibility of something that has been reported. Tropology gives an account of mystical understandings for the purpose of amending our lives. Anagogy leads the way to the more sacred mysteries of heavenly figures.[29]

In this passage can be seen an attempt at harmonization with the "Platonic" division of philosophy, which is analogous to the one that has already been proffered to us by Clement and that we shall presently find in the work of Origen. This division, adopted with variants by authors such as Seneca[30] and Quintilian,[31] had become classic. Saint Augustine had reproduced it many a time.[32] Only the application made to Scripture is no longer completely the same as it is in the work of the two Alexandrians, since this time it is a case, without any possible doubt, of a plurality of senses.[33] Notwithstanding Eucher's phrase, "is not therefore incongruent,"[34] it can seem that we should much rather speak of a contrast between the "philosophy of worldly wisdom" and the "heavenly philosophy of the Scriptures," when we see "physics" or natural science changed into biblical history. Well or badly founded as they may be, successful or unsuccessful as they may be, the transpositions of this genre are no less cogent in manifesting an urgent and irrepressible need of the time, for it was a need that was inextricably linked with the consciousness that Christian thinkers had of being the heirs to the legacy of ancient thought and of being called, after having vanquished it, to assume its role entirely, to assimilate it by transfiguring it.[35] Thus, there was, to be sure, something quite fundamental in this desire to make the science of the Scriptures equivalent in some way to the "threefold science," as Saint Jerome termed it,[36] that is to say, to universal science, to repeat it at a higher level, in order

either to be substituted for it or to absorb it. Nevertheless, this investigation was conducted after the fact. Neither the number nor the order of the senses enumerated by Eucher depends on it. One arrives at a good perception of this when one studies the history of the various ingenious correlations that were devised in succession to one another. We, too, have no good reason to linger on this point.

On the contrary, the formula introduced by Eucher is quite realistically superimposed on the threefold division of human nature into body, soul, and spirit. The same situation, in fact, obtained in the work of Cassian. Before Eucher and Cassian, Saint Jerome had said:

> Thus Scriptures have a regulated mode of discourse that is threefold in our hearts. In the first place, we are meant to understand them historically, in the second place, tropologically, and, in the third place, according to a spiritual understanding. And with his peace Christ will hallow and make perfect all such persons whom he finds to have kept sound in body, soul, and spirit, having in themselves the perfect truth of the threefold knowledge.[37]

This was truly a commonplace. Priscillian is another of our witnesses. He finds a way of pouring his ascetical doctrine into this ready-made mold:

> In the first place, you must understand that in all of its sayings the whole of Scripture either speaks, arranged as it is according to a threefold enterprise of understanding, or else, in destroying the work of the world in us, it holds in check the husk of our earthly flesh in its concupiscences . . . ; or going back to the divine origin of the soul, it shapes those things which seem hard pressed by the idolatrous vices of our days, our months, our times, and our inclinations, governed as they are by our being born of this earth . . . ; or else, to be sure, Scripture shows God witnessing to himself every day as a man who has suffered for us and is our judge. Thus, because he wanted us to be partakers of his divine nature, he presses us body, soul, and spirit, with the threefold observance of his precepts. . . .[38]

This sort of anatomy of man was biblical as well as Greek. In particular it was Pauline. It was destined, moreover, to be frequent in the Christian tradition.[39] Isidore of Seville was to be the one to transmit it to the Middle Ages.[40] The passage from the First Letter to the Thessalonians[41] that ex-

presses the idea was forever being cited.[42] Nevertheless, its being used hermeneutically seems to presuppose, on the part of Scripture, an analogy to man which, in itself, is not scriptural. Perhaps, if we attempt to understand it properly, the idea underlying this analogy is not at all as arbitrary as might be thought. But from it there arose a twofold risk, stemming from a twofold ambiguity. First of all, there was the ambiguity of "tropology," which has already been noted and which was attached to the intermediary principle between body and spirit: the "psuchē" of Scripture, introduced before its "pneuma," ran the risk of failing utterly to respond to the intentions of the Spirit, even in the cases where its content would yield up nothing that is not orthodox and reasonable. There was also the ambiguity of the last term, anagogy, in its relationship to the spirit. It was a new ambiguity, symbolized, it could be said, by the duality of the Greek words that we translate by "spirit," even as Latin speakers already translated the two of them by "spiritus": "nous" and "pneuma." The spiritual understanding to which one is raised by anagogy can be understood as an understanding of the "pneumatika" of Scripture, or as an understanding of its "noēta," of its "noēmata." Now if the "pneumatika" are in fact contained under the form of the letter, because they are placed there by the Holy Spirit, the existence of the "noēta" is problematic. They can be reduced to quite human "nooumena," which is to say, in this case, quite subjective, inconsistent analogues to those "nooumena" that pagan philosophers strove to extract from their myths.[43] And the "nous" that one claims to achieve in this way does not really go beyond "psuchē."[44] In other words, this "spiritual understanding" of Scripture can be the exegetically arbitrary fruit of a reflection or a contemplation of a philosophical nature, or, to be sure, the fruit of a discernment whose principle is the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ. On the one hand, one would have a kind of Platonic movement, a thrust that reaches only from the sensible to the intelligible, from the visible to the invisible.[45] On the other hand, there is the Christian interpretation, which is derived from past facts and proceeds to the Mystery that is to come. This is an "intelligible world," a universe of spiritual realities. The Latin of the translations includes two epithets: "intelligibilis" and "spiritalis."[46] In fact, as with the Greek words, one is most often mistaken for the other. Nevertheless, we may indeed use this effective duality of words, which was to last right through the whole course of the Middle Ages,[47] as a sign, in order to indicate a duality of doctrine and spiritual attitude that is at least possible and consequently a real danger.

In this tripartite formula, the danger is so much the more real, in that there cannot be found in it an explicit allusion to the Mystery that is at

once historical and spiritual, interior and social, a Mystery which is recapitulated in the other formula by "allegoria." Although "the truth of factual deeds" and "the trustworthiness of the account"[48] are basically retained in Eucher's formula, it cannot be denied that the tendency represented by it has something of an unhistorical component, and, indeed, the whole of that small opus which is the *Formulae* gives the impression that there is too much mere hinting at the Mystery of Christ: "the secrets of the Scriptures"[49] seem a little like a series of objects that are apt to prompt a whole host of lofty thoughts, the object of the book being to provide a key to them.

This possible duality in the quest for understanding, the duality of "nous" and "pneuma," offers a certain analogy with the duality of "erōs" and "agapē," that is to say, human love and divine charity. Yet it would be no more fitting in this case of the "spirit" than in the case of "love" to force a system of contrasts on the basis simply of vocabulary as an indicator. Just as an authentically supernatural love that is consonant with the givens of Scripture could be expressed in the terminology of "erōs," so could an authentically Christian understanding of the Holy Books, an understanding that comes from the "Spirit of Christ," be defined, as in the case of the writings of St. Paul himself, according to a vocabulary of "nous."[50] The epithet "intelligibilis" is to be found right up to the time of Saint Bernard.[51] In Christian antiquity, "mental contemplation" as practiced and recommended by Saint Gregory of Nyssa, for example, was indeed pregnant with the whole Christian mystery.[52] As much would be said of Saint John Chrysostom's "taking up and examining what is thinkable."[53] And those "thoughts about what is reported," which, in the words of Saint Maximus the Confessor, gladden the spirit of the friends of God, were quite unequivocally the Christian realities objectively prefigured in the factual events of the Bible.[54]

Eucher is not a thinker or an original writer. He has no wish to be. The hallmark of his work is insufficiency rather than distortion. His formulary, which was not without its analogues in antiquity, is our inauguration into the list of lexicons and miscellanies that belong to the first part of the Middle Ages. He prepares the way for Pseudo-Melito's famous *Clavis*. His methodological preface already evinces certain traits associated with "the scholastic way of speaking."[55] In fact, in this preface — putting aside the parallel with the three parts of philosophy, which was not explicit in the work of his two Latin predecessors — he appears to depend above all on Saint Jerome and the predecessors of Cassian. From Jerome he borrows the division of the senses that was founded on the tripartite division of

man. Several of his phrases concerning "the discipline of our religion"[56] and its two branches, practical and theoretical, are to be found in Cassian almost to the letter.[57] Moreover, Eucher does not hold fast to the three terms, history, tropology, and anagogy, any more than does Cassian. If his formula, in appearance, at least, is less composite, this is because it includes an appendix. Straightaway he adds:

> There are even those who think that allegory should be added to this class of knowledge in the fourth place, and who assert that this narrative of deeds that have been done reveals a shadow of the future.[58]

The linkage is clumsy, or, rather, it is not even attempted, although the phrase that follows sketches a very poor attempt at harmonization.[59] Nevertheless, it remains true that, by this modest addition, the whole of Christian reality attains the splendid light of day and is strengthened.

4. Origen

Throughout the length of the Middle Ages, then, there are two different ordering lists. At the origins of one we find Saint Augustine and, in particular, Saint Gregory. At the origins of the other we find Cassian and Saint Eucher, and even, albeit less systematically, Saint Ambrose and Saint Jerome. After this, we find contaminatory exchanges from one list to the other. These exchanges occur on both sides of the issue, but are principally applicable to the work of Eucher and Cassian. Clearly we must go further back. Is this something we have to do in order to discover two distinct sources? The answer is "yes and no." For, right from the beginning, there are two lists that are not reducible one to the other. But these two lists, with the two orders that characterize them, can both be found in the same author, the author who dominates the whole of the later tradition: Origen.

The sequence of history, morality, and allegory (or anagogy), which would turn out to be that of Eucher and Cassian, is already a trademark of Origen. Already Origen has connected it to a threefold division of man, a division which he recalls repeatedly and which he claims to found on Scripture,[1] since, as he observes, "in all of Scripture there is a difference between soul and spirit.[2]" What is more, by a bold analogy he applies this division to Scripture itself. He believes that Scripture, like man, has a body, soul, and spirit. For this reason, he makes the following descriptive cor-

relations: corporeal sense for history, psychical sense for morality, and spiritual sense for allegory (or anagogy). What we find at this point in his work is a transposition of the old analogy between microcosm and macrocosm, which he goes on to criticize.[3] Furthermore, he admits that in certain passages of the Bible one or another of the three senses can be lacking. This is an observation that Gregory and many others after him made as well. Notably, there are texts, he believes, which do not include a "corporeal sense."[4] But this reservation will demand our attention in other chapters.

The principal excerpt in this regard is that from the *Periarchôn*, the Greek text of which has been preserved. We shall, however, cite it as translated by Rufinus, which is how the whole of the West encountered it:

> . . . Therefore, everyone must represent the understanding of the Divine Scriptures in his soul in a threefold way, namely:
>
> 1) in such a way that all those who are more simple may be edified by the very body, so to speak, of the Scriptures (thus we call this the common and historical understanding);
> 2) in such a way that, if any have begun to advance somewhat and are able to consider things in broader terms, they may be edified by the very soul of Scripture;
> 3) in such a way that those who are perfect and similar to the perfect, about whom the Apostle says: "Yet among the mature we do impart wisdom, although it is not a wisdom of this age or of the rulers of this age, who are doomed to pass away. But we impart a secret and hidden wisdom of God, which God decreed before the ages for our glorification" (1 Cor. 2:6-7), may be edified by the spiritual law itself, which "contains the shadow of future bliss," no less than by the spirit.
>
> Therefore, just as man is said to consist of body, soul, and spirit, so also does Holy Scripture, which has been given by the bounty of God for the salvation of men.[5]

No less clear is a passage from the commentary on Leviticus, also preserved in Greek and Latin:

> Since, therefore, Scripture itself consists, as it were, of a body that is perceived, of a soul which is understood and conceived to be in

> the body, and of a spirit according to the shadowy exemplars of the heavenly things, come, then, let us invoke him who made the body, soul, and spirit of Scripture, a body for those who have preceded us, a soul for us, and a spirit for those who are destined to possess eternal life in a future age and to arrive at the heavenly truth of the law. At the present time, let us investigate the soul, not the letter. If we can do this much, let us make our ascent to the spirit, in the manner of the sacrifices that we have just been reading about.[6]

The perspective of this text is no longer quite the same as that of the *Periarchôn*. But we can for the moment disregard the difference between them. The same order appears yet again, with or without mention of the human analogy, in a certain number of other passages, in which Origen, beginning with the "firsthand literal aspect,"[7] yields to considerations of "moral doctrine" before arriving at a "mystical understanding" or "the secret of the mysteries of God's wisdom and knowledge,"[8] which in the end concern "future goods." It is while alluding to this order that he says, in the course of a homily on the Book of Numbers: "Consideration of this threefold sacrament runs through all of the Scriptures."[9] It is this order alone, together with the analogy that supports it, that most historians, in the wake of Protestant controversialists in the past, point out in the work of Origen. Thus, if we call to mind only a certain number of recent examples, we find: K. R. Hagenbach,[10] Bardenhewer,[11] C. A. Briggs,[12] Father Alberto Vaccari,[13] Miss M. M. Davy,[14] Father de Ghellinck,[15] Edgar de Bruyne,[16] H. Caplan[17], André Loyen,[18] Father M. Hermaniuk,[19] M. L. W. Laistner,[20] J. F. Bethune-Baker,[21] Father Denys Lasíc,[22] R. Loewe,[23] and Fr. B. Artz.[24] Additionally, although they espouse a more nuanced position, we find people like H. A. Wolfson[25] and Father Jean Daniélou.[26] Now we have here, I believe, a serious lacuna, which impoverishes the exposition of Origen's doctrine and which can also result in falsifying the meaning of Origen's exegesis, insofar as what it offers is essential. Consequently, the meaning of the exegesis that prolongs Origen's doctrine through the many centuries risks being falsified as well. Father Ferdinand Prat saw matters more truly when he observed, on the one hand, that "in practice, Origen almost always neglects the intermediate sense" and that, this being the case, "his trichotomy is reduced to two terms: letter and spirit,"[27] and, on the other hand, that in a certain number of homilies in particular "the order is different."[28]

This last observation has great significance. Even so, it strikes me as being somewhat too timid in its expression. Numerous indeed are the texts

in which another order is followed. These texts are even more numerous in the work of Origen, as it has come down to us. The remarks of Erasmus were most apt:

> This is the order that he [Origen] follows: he begins by explaining the history clearly and briefly, each time that the subject demands it. Then he stimulates his audience to discover the deepest meanings of the allegory. And immediately after that he deals with the moral aspects.[29]

So, too, with Sixtus of Siena:

> In his homilies Origen touches on an examination of the history . . . but he makes his ascent towards meanings that require a higher understanding, and then he descends again from these meanings to moral situations and brief words of encouragement and exhortation.[30]

This estimation of the situation was shared by a Protestant theologian like Salomon Glassius[31] and by an Anglican like William Cave. In his *Literary History of Ecclesiastical Writers* Cave explains that:

> [Origen] applied a kind of threefold system of explication to the interpretation of Scripture. It was his wont to elicit a threefold sense from Scripture and to investigate the three, namely, the historical . . . mystical, and moral senses. In general his progress is from the historical sense to the mystical one, and from the mystical sense to the moral one, although sometimes he changes this order.[32]

Let us take, as an example, the second homily on Genesis. Origen sets himself the task of explaining Noah's ark:

> The first [exposition], which preceded, is historical, akin to a sort of foundation that has been placed in the lower area of the structure. The second exposition is this mystical one, which is higher and loftier. Now, if we can, let us try adding a third mode of exposition, the moral one.[33]

Or we can take the first and third homilies on Exodus, where we are dealing with the multiplication of the sons of Israel in Egypt after the death of Joseph,[34] then their flight from Egypt and their three days' journey

in the desert to the place of sacrifice.[35] Both of these homilies follow the same order. It is this order, rendered more or less explicit, that is encountered constantly in the *Homilies*.[36] Using the historical givens provided by the text of the Old Testament, Origen evokes the mystery of Christ under one or another of its aspects. The mystery is then applied to the Christian soul, whose life is caught up in him: "Blessed, therefore, are the souls who thus follow Christ, in the same way as Christ has blazed the way for them."[37] A person has merely to read this in order to see and be aware of what is happening. In the year 1931, W. Völker asked people to show some willingness to read these homilies by Origen. Unfortunately, his exhortation seems to have fallen on deaf ears.[38]

An order like this, which is in opposition to the classical text of the *Periarchôn*, does not seem, however, to be the result, as it were, of some lapse or mischance of the pen. It is not the result of a temporary negligence or laxity in the rigorous work of writing. It is impossible, moreover, to attribute it to some kind of liberty taken by the translator to rework the material. It can only result from a very conscious intention on the part of the author, an intention that is heavily laden with doctrinal importance. Indeed, it suggests an appropriate commentary that unfolds in an organic manner, and it could not be inverted without ruining the whole economy of the passages where it holds sway. The whole movement of thought depends on it. It is this order too, quite notably, which is dominant from beginning to end (an essential point) in the commentary on the Song of Songs. As Genebrard noted,[39] the individual soul always makes its appearance here within the Church. Its union with the Word is shown here as being a consequence of the union of Christ with his Church. The different applications that concern the soul are always the object of a "third exposition" or a "third category of exposition,"[40] which depends on the mystery of the Church. It is this same order which governs the interpretation of Psalm 44, that royal epithalamium. There the queen adorned with garments of gold is the Church. It is to the Church that the Father addresses himself as to his daughter. It is the Church that is led to Christ, and it is in her that souls, united by faith and virtue, are made one.[41]

Now a comparison of the two series of texts is sufficient to enable us to see how an extreme difference arises between them. On the one hand, a moral sense obtains, and this, coming as it does immediately after the letter or the "body" of Scripture, corresponds to the "soul" and precedes the sense which acts as the carrier of "spirit." On the other hand, the moral sense which prolongs and presupposes the allegorical or mystical sense is properly speaking "spiritual." This is a profound difference, because it

is structural. In the first instance, Origen draws diverse "moralities" from the sacred text. It is possible for them to have nothing specifically Christian, even before one reads in them any allusion to the Mystery of Christ. This is what it is the custom nowadays to call, in a misleading turn of phrase, his "allegorism," a term which is, indeed, opposed to ancient rules of usage. In the second case, we have the same starting point of "history," and it is only after a statement of the Mystery and in relationship to it that he arrives at a spiritual explication. In the first case, he gives us, in general, a series of speculations on the soul, its faculties, its virtues, etc. This amounts to a kind of moral anatomy and physiology, "a physics of the soul," said Philo. It is a description of "microcosm," and is of a rather philosophical, abstract, and nontemporal nature. In the second case, he expounds an asceticism and a mysticism that has a christological, ecclesial, and sacramental complexion. Founded as it is on dogma, it is a veritable history of the spiritual life. In this second case, Origen's exegesis, connected in its entirety to "the soul of the believer,"[42] to "the soul of the one who is faithful,"[43] and to "the ecclesiastical soul"[44] or "the soul that is in the Church,"[45] is thus wholly Christian, in its content no less than in its form, in its end results no less than in its deeply rooted foundations. Regarding Origen's exegesis, one can, while investing it with a more pregnant significance, take up the observation made by Saint Jerome about the complementary approach brought by Origen to the philosophical explication of Hebrew names: "Among the other splendid monuments of his genius, he toiled as well with the following object in mind, namely, that as a Christian he might complete what Philo as a Jew had omitted."[46] In the first case, the doctrine expressed was almost always a wholly human speculation. The formal principle of the exegesis charged with nourishing it was an arbitrary principle, not resting on any plausible given of the biblical text or even of revelation in general. It was not able to invoke, in its favor, in a positive manner, the "analogy of faith." This kind of exegesis, therefore, made its sacrificial obeisance, in fact, to the mentality of a time and place. In the formulation of its second sense, it recalled the habitual exegesis of Philo and the "Therapeutae,"[47] which was also the exegesis of the *Letter of Aristeas*. It resembled the methods of allegorization espoused by profane philosophy, which was presently about to assume a greater breadth in neoplatonism, although, as in the work of Philo himself, it differed from it in an essential manner by its upholding of the first sense. Even if it did not always owe its content to Philo and his rivals, it never ceased paying them tribute, even while it went beyond them.

We say "even while it went beyond them" because there is no threefold

sense to be found in Philo. There is nothing in his work or in the work of anybody else outside of the Christian tradition that truly corresponds to Origen's third sense, his mystical or spiritual sense. There could not possibly have been anything like this to be found in any of them, since there was nothing in their consciousness that resembled the regenerative newness of the Christian fact. Philo recognized only two senses. One of the latest historians of his exegesis has demonstrated this well.[48] It is true that H. A. Wolfson, in his all-encompassing Philonic zeal, went on to try to establish that the philosophy of the Fathers of the Church owes entirely to Philo. This conviction led him to make an excessive connection between Origen's classification of the biblical senses and Philo's classification. The essential aspect of the operation consists of noticing that Philo's "nonliteral" interpretations are sometimes "moral," when they refer to the human soul, and sometimes "physical," when they refer to the cosmos. Through this twofold division Philo becomes a witness for Wolfson to the "threefold sense." In this case, nothing more remains to be done except to make his "physical" sense coincide with Origen's third sense. But this cannot be done without reducing Origen's spiritual sense as well as Clement's theological sense to this "physical" sense — that is to say, without suppressing the Christian reality which comprises its structural originality. Thus, the whole Christian interpretation of the Scriptures, which fills Origen's work, is no more than a "modified form of Philo's two kinds of philosophical interpretation."[49] In reality, however, such a concordance is totally arbitrary. Origen's texts, like those of Clement before him, are opposed to it in an express manner. Our two Alexandrians are both well aware, in fact, of this "physical" or cosmic sense. We will see examples of this in the following paragraph. They borrow some exegetical elaborations of it from Philo, from Josephus, or from the Jewish tradition in general. But they could not confuse it with the Christian sense that they find in the Bible. "Physical" or "moral" though it might be in its content, it is for Origen in this case always a question of the same second sense.

To be more precise, Origen makes this "physical" sense correspond to the "soul," not to the "spirit." And when, on the other hand, he distinguishes the three "general disciplines" which are conducive to scientific knowledge, he enumerates them as "ethics, physics, and enoptics," and places them in an analogical relationship with the "triple form of divine philosophy."[50] Keeping the same order all the while, he also speaks of: "practical experience, physical theory, and theology";[51] or also: "ethical doctrines, physical doctrines, and mystical doctrines."[52] In the prologue to the commentary on the Song of Songs, he makes ethics correspond with

Proverbs, physics to Ecclesiastes, and enoptics to the Song of Songs, in which is to be found the quintessence of Scripture's spiritual teachings.[53] Enoptics, theology, mystical sense, spiritual understanding: such are Origen's equivalent categories. "Physics" remains excluded from them.[54]

> "The odor of your perfumes" — clearly spiritual and mystical understanding — "above all the fragrant spices" of moral and natural philosophy.[55]

Wolfson would have been a little less poorly inspired if he had reconciled Origen's third sense with the system of exegesis practiced by Philo in some of his works, notably in his treatise *On the Migration of Abraham.* In this system, the biblical facts are taken as symbols of the itinerary of the soul in its journey toward salvation.[56] With regard to Philo, moreover, we may speak not merely of three senses, but even of four, since he himself enumerates them with regard to any given biblical text. This is what we find in his *Questions on Genesis* concerning the tree of life. This tree, he claims, has been understood by some as earth, or the intermediary heavens, or the sun. By others it has been understood as the directing part of the soul. Finally, others, the best commentators, have seen it as "the most perfect virtue, piety, which alone can give immortality."[57] He goes on to compare the perception of this last kind of sense to initiation in the "great mysteries."[58] In this instance, do we not have, beyond the literal sense, a physical or cosmic sense, then an anthropological or moral sense, and lastly a mystical or spiritual sense? Is there not an undeniable resemblance between this last sense and Origen's spiritual sense? In both cases, does the exegete not penetrate beyond the domain of science or philosophy, in order to describe the soul's concrete progress in its relationship with God? We should note, however, that Philo does not himself practice a threefold or fourfold exegesis on any one text and that he does not arrange and classify these different nonliteral senses. For him they are merely different systems of interpretation. He encounters examples of these in the work of diverse exegetes and seems to propose a choice between them. By turns he adopts one or the other of them according to the complexion of his treatises.[59] There is something more fundamental that needs to be remarked on: Philo cannot found his "mystical" exegesis on the sole foundation that would render it objective: "the mystery hidden in God until it was revealed in Jesus Christ."[60] For this reason its character is fairly abstract and very slightly differentiated in comparison with the "moral" exegesis of that higher exegesis which he compares to an initiation.[61] Now it is to this

"mystery," contained in the biblical reality, that Origen makes his appeal, just as he appeals to "the sense of Christ"[62] in order to discover it therein. It is this mystery that he always presupposes. It is from this mystery that all his "mysticism" springs. Thus, however numerous may be the borrowings that Origen makes from Philo on another level, it is impossible to assimilate these two exegeses. Origen's third sense serves not merely to "modify" Philo's exegesis, or, to put it more broadly, Jewish exegesis in general. Jewish exegesis is really and truly surpassed, since what is at stake now is a new principle which owes nothing to it.[63]

5. Origen's Descendants

In considering the writings of the Fathers of the Church, it would be an error to misconstrue everything that in any way recalls Philo, that "most broadly learned man,"[1] as some sort of aboriginal flaw. To do so would be to admit the possibility that Scripture itself might be open to censure. How could there be a denial of any kind of link between Philo and the Letter to the Hebrews,[2] even if there is no direct connection between the two of them? Furthermore, what is called Philonism in the work of Origen and others is often in reality merely fidelity to the teaching of this Letter. It must, however, be admitted that the inheritance or memory of moral reflections which are of a Philonian nature has burdened Christian exegesis with an arbitrary element and has too often kept a specifically Christian understanding from blossoming forth in its fullness. Many a page in the works of Origen is encumbered with it. We can still admire it, from a quite historical point of view, as a fact of culture, from which this great man was capable, on more than one occasion, of extracting matter that is quite beautiful. But we have nothing solid to extract from it in terms of our knowledge of the Bible or our meditation on the mystery of faith. Quite happily, even when Origen develops this sense that we call Philonian, he does not stop there. Sometimes he does even more than surpass it. Without rejecting it absolutely, he shows that he does not come away from it the loser. Without wasting any time, he counterposes a Christian interpretation. This is what he does, for example, in his treatment of the mid-wives of Egypt, who, in their fear of God, did not execute the sentence of death decreed by barbarous order of Pharaoh:

> Certain commentators before us have said that those mid-wives represent the idea of rational learning. . . . As far as I am concerned,

> however, the mid-wives seem to portray the notion of both the two Testaments.[3]

This is how, moreover, he deals with the Tabernacle, the ark of the covenant, and the garments of the high priest as they are described in Exodus and Leviticus. Among the Jews these were the objects of a symbolic interpretation, following a cosmic pattern. Was such an interpretation not already given by the Book of Wisdom, as well as by Josephus and Philo?[4] Did not even Saint Matthew's Gospel presuppose a similar symbolism, with regard to the veil of the Temple being torn?[5] In addition, Christian tradition in general has retained such an interpretation,[6] and the most recent exegetes are in agreement with this line of thought.[7] In any case, it would not be easy for a Christian commentator on Scripture in the third century to pass over it in silence. Nevertheless, Origen scarcely mentions it,[8] whereas, in two homilies, he develops "another opinion at length," an opinion inspired by "David" and Saint Paul.[9] In time, Saint Jerome would come to recall this "Hebraic explanation"[10] at much greater length, and, being less scrupulous than the Alexandrian, he is indeed anxious to justify it just as it stands.[11] In the Middle Ages, there is a discreet effort to shift the notion from the spiritual plane of priesthood to the temporal plane of empire. In imitation of the Jewish high priest, it is not the sovereign pontiff, but the emperor, who bears the mantle embroidered with the signs of the zodiac, which represent the vault of the heavens.[12] Origen would have approved of this ingenious transposition, which preserved Christian transcendence. Rupert of Deutz offers us another kind of transcendence, a more essential one, when he applies the symbolism of the high priest's garments to Jesus Christ.[13] And there is a more direct imitation of Origen on his part when he writes, on the same passage in Exodus:

> Therefore we subjoin the mystical reasons for each of them, just as they were adduced by the Fathers, first, in accordance with the Hebraic Fathers and then in accordance with the Church Fathers.[14]

An author who comes later still than Rupert and who uses a composite formula in four parts enables us to comprehend in earnest this juxtaposition of two different kinds of exegesis, as well as the way in which one surpasses the other. Isaac of Stella, in his commentary on the miracle at Cana, observes that the stone jars provided for purification each contained either "two" or "three measures." The two measures, he explains, represent exegesis after the fashion of the Gentiles, who, in their mysteries,

make a distinction between two senses, one "physical" and the other "ethical." But as for us Christians, our exegesis contains "three measures" because in Jewish literature we discern, beyond "history" and "morality," yet another understanding, "the allegorical one," and sometimes even a fourth one, "the anagogical" understanding.[15]

But more often, perhaps, than going beyond or rejecting the intermediary, psychic sense, Origen breaks away from it completely. Accordingly, he no longer even alludes to it, and this form of exegesis is no longer capable of finding its place in a scheme whose structure is integrally Christian. Let us refer to two more examples of this second schematic arrangement. The seventh homily on the Book of Joshua gives us this commentary on the taking of Jericho:

> The walls of Jericho collapse at the sound of the trumpets. Jericho is the picture of this age, whose mighty ramparts we see destroyed by the prayers of priests. These mighty ramparts were idol worship. . . . But Our Lord Jesus Christ, whose coming the son of Nun prefigured, sends his apostles as priests, and they bear resounding trumpets, namely, the Gospel . . . , and all the engines of idolatry and the dogmas of the philosophers are laid waste from top to bottom. . . .
>
> Now the whole people raised a great outcry, etc. — But each one of us ought of himself to perform these things. By faith you have Jesus in you as your head. Your resounding trumpets are the Holy Scriptures . . . , and when your flesh and your spirit are at last in harmony, cry out your joy, since for you the world will have been destroyed. . . .[16]

Elsewhere, in the twenty-seventh homily on Numbers, the forty-two stops that the Hebrews made in the desert before arriving at the Jordan, within sight of the Promised Land, signify a twofold mystery: "Christ's descent to us was through forty-two ancestors in the flesh as if by so many stopping places, and it is through the same number of stops," which have come to be interiorized within themselves, "that the sons of Israel ascend to the place where the promised inheritance has its beginnings."[17]

The first of Origen's two schematic arrangements is the one that we have seen, substantially, in Cassian and then in Eucher. What seems evident is that both of them had, in fact, received it from Origen, either directly or through various intermediaries, such as Evagrius or Saint Jerome. We know that as early as the year 416 Evagrius had been recommended by Palladius, and Cassian, who had known and admired his

disciples in the East before founding the monastery of Saint Victor at Marseilles, could not have been unaware of him when he was compiling his *Conferences*, which were "very probably published in the second half of the year 426."[18] He never cites Origen. But the research undertaken by Dom Salvatore Marsili no longer allows us to doubt that Cassian had read him, or at least that he depends on him closely.[19] He had certainly considered Origen's *De principiis* as well as several other writings of his that had been translated by Jerome and Rufinus, most notably the commentary on the Song of Songs and the homilies on Genesis and Exodus.[20] Given these background conditions, the personality of the Abbot Nesteros, whom he has speak in his fourteenth Conference, counts for relatively little. Without a doubt, this ancient "anchorite" really existed. He lived alone, on a small island in the delta of the Nile, when Cassian visited him around the year 390. It would, however, be attributing too much importance to their conversation to consider it as the source of an original teaching on the senses of Scripture, a teaching which would have long been held in check by the success, less merited, of the teaching of Origen, only to triumph, at long last, in the thirteenth century, thanks to its adoption by the Scholastics. I have not succeeded in perceiving the contrasts between the two teachings to which Father Vaccari draws attention. The teaching of the *Periarchôn* does not, as he supposes, imply the spiritual sense's total independence from the literal sense, nor does the teaching of the *Conferences* imply the absolute superiority of the literal over the spiritual. It must be declared by way of rejoinder that on both sides of the issue, in spite of the numerical difference, the order that is followed is the same. If, therefore, it is indeed true that the tradition relative to the biblical senses is twofold, if in fact there exist two systems with "profound and radical" differences, well founded in every respect other than a superficial difference of number, these two systems are not those of Origen and Cassian. Both of the systems come from the same person, namely, Origen. Besides, the few authors that Father Vaccari cites as being in the line of thought which he supposes to be Cassian's actually reproduce a schematic arrangement which is neither that of the *Periarchôn* nor that of the *Conferences*. Rather, it is Origen's second schematic arrangement, the one that we have already encountered in the work of Saint Gregory the Great.[21]

Both Cassian and Eucher, on the one hand, and Gregory, on the other, are therefore equally heirs of Origen. In Gregory's case, it is not only his manner of understanding the threefold sense that makes him reminiscent of Origen but also certain exegetical details and a likeness of mind which is perhaps connatural. Even certain words,[22] certain expressions, or certain

turns of phrase which are characteristic of Gregory's style hark back to those of his great Greek predecessor, in the form, at least, which had been given them by the Latin of Rufinus.[23] In the question that now preoccupies us it seems that in the end Saint Gregory depends even more on Origen than he does on Saint Augustine.

In both of his schematic arrangements Origen gives only one list with three members. He seems to hold to this number. But in his work, all the elements to form the fourfold sense can already be found. All the elements, and all the substance. As Father Prat recalls, Sixtus of Siena and Huet had a very clear understanding of this.[24] We shall get a better sense of it somewhat later. In other respects, the great Alexandrian did no more than systematize, in a brilliantly inspired way and with a superabundant flourish (which we may find disconcerting) a more ancient tradition, if indeed it is true — to take the matter back no earlier in time — that Saint Irenaeus recognizes the spiritual sense of Scripture "in the three forms of it which will become classic in exegesis: the allegorical, tropological, and anagogical senses."[25] In any case, it is not an exaggeration to say that Origen's influence on the establishment of the doctrine of the fourfold sense, like his influence on all western hermeneutics and exegesis, was determinant. No other influence was the equal of his. But what we must also take into account is that the workings of his influence were not merely initiatory and distant.

"What most of the Fathers who lived after Origen," wrote Richard Simon, "did almost exclusively was to copy his commentaries and his other treatises on Scripture," and "the very persons who were the most opposed to his opinions could not help reading them and profiting from them."[26] For they all knew him to be "the one who was the most expert in divine law."[27] Not being content to borrow the occasional exegetical approach or a few particular ideas here and there from him, they sought and received from him "an exposition of all the doctrinal and allegorical interpretations of the Holy Books."[28] There was no body of work that incited "Latin pilferings"[29] as much as his own. Eusebius of Vercelli, Zeno of Verona, Gaudentius of Brescia, and Victorinus of Pettau owe a great deal to Origen. Also in his debt are Saint Hilary and Saint Ambrose,[30] although the unkind remarks to which Saint Jerome gives vent on this subject should not be taken literally.[31] Saint Ambrose, in whose work are found many moral standards taken directly from Philo, is especially retentive of Origen's first schematic arrangement,[32] but welcomes the second one as well.[33] Saint Jerome, too, adopts one or the other of these schematic arrangements, depending on the occasion.[34] Whatever has been said of

him at times, right to the end he never stopped relying heavily on Origen's writings[35] and utilizing his categories.[36] As for Saint Augustine, he was well enough aware of Origen's story, the account of which he received in the version of Eusebius translated by Rufinus. He was, moreover, very much interested in his thought. Nevertheless, it is not easy to specify precisely what knowledge he could have had of his writings.[37] This knowledge has sometimes been minimized.[38] He refers more than once to Origen — in terms both of praise and blame. He was not, doubtless, the man to whom fell the task of translating the Origenian *corpus*, as Simplicianus, the bishop of Milan, reportedly bade him do one day.[39] But it is certain that he attached great importance to the translations made by Hilary, and afterward by Jerome and Rufinus, for if he knew Greek, he did not read it fluently. He certainly read Origen's homilies on Genesis and the *De principiis*. Most likely he read the latter work in Saint Jerome's translation, if not in both translations, that is, that of Saint Jerome and that of Rufinus.[40] There are abundant correspondences of both ideas and themes between the work of Augustine and the work of Origen.[41] At times resemblances are even to be found in the form of a shared emphasis and the common impulses of their mind and spirit.[42] These likenesses are all the more significant in that they concern two such different geniuses. More than once, the contradictions that one had thought to come into play between them turn out to be nonexistent.[43] In its broad outlines, in terms of both its best and most debatable aspects, their system of hermeneutics is the same. Augustine's exegesis is sometimes very closely reminiscent of Origen's.[44] On the other hand, in what touches more immediately on our subject, the relationship between them is not very evident. Perhaps this can be explained, in part at least, by the fact that they had not embarked on the study of Scripture in the same manner. From his childhood Origen had received an "ecclesiastical" formation. If he had practiced allegory, it had not usually been "with a view to rehabilitating Holy Scripture, which appeared simple to the Pagans," as Ellies-Dupin said[45] — an assessment that is still espoused. When faced with the Bible, he never evinced that kind of fear or disgust, mingled with human respect, which would hold Augustine back for quite some time before his baptism and which would also serve to cast him at first into the camp of the Manichaeans, as the *Confessions* bear witness.[46] He did not have to overcome aesthetic prejudices, which were so strong among literate Latin speakers of the fourth century, sorely tried as they were by "the ecclesiastical interpretation"[47] of the Holy Books, by that "verbal baseness,"[48] the blame for which they strove to project onto the mediocrity of the translators, or for which they

undertook, somewhat laboriously, to fashion an apology.[49] He had not been tempted by the criterion that consisted of "aural voluptuousness."[50] He had not had to pass through a crisis similar to the one alluded to in Saint Jerome's famous dream. Neither had he been forced to choose "between two vocations, that of theoretician and that of biblical exegete,"[51] as Saint Jerome had been constrained to do, to a certain point, at least. If he undertook a defense of the "unbeautiful" Word of God against Celsus, he had not had to overcome the scandal of it for himself.[52] If he mentions the deficiency of translations, it is only in virtue of a subsidiary argument.[53] The spontaneous movement of his thought led him to understand that "the brilliant and persuasive expression" of human wisdom, which men pursue for money, is mere rubbish in comparison with the words of the Lord.[54] Furthermore, his allegorism was substantially less burdened with that rhetorical, literary facade with which Saint Augustine would imbue his own allegorism and which continues to delude some historians even in our own day.[55]

Another, less illustrious African, Saint Quodvultdeus, uses Origen in his *Liber de promissionibus et praedictionibus*. What is more, he considers his Homilies on the Hexateuch well enough known by the Latin-speaking public to be able to say, about Leviticus:

> It was not right and proper for many things to be said here, since Origen, in his discussion of individual matters, put the seal of Christ the Lord on what he sensed with his upright faith.[56]

The Italian Julian of Eclanum shows himself well acquainted with the controversy raised by Origen's interpretation of the story of Hosea.[57] The Spanish Saint Gregory, bishop of Elvira (Illiberis, Grenada), who probably lived to the very end of the fourth century,[58] was so imbued with Origen's hermeneutics and themes that some excellent critics were able at first to take a collection of his sermons — if they are indeed his, and not those of another early fifth-century Spanish writer[59] — for *Treatises of Origen*.[60] Five other sermons of his, in which he was the first in the Latin West to explain the Song of Songs to people, also reflect, albeit not slavishly, the interpretations of Origen.[61] When Rufinus of Aquileia undertakes some exegesis on his own account, he adopts Origen's second schematic arrangement,[62] whatever Gennadius says of it.[63] As for Cassian, who, as we have seen, adopts the first schematic arrangement, he was one of the most efficacious intermediaries for the transmission of Origen's teaching on the senses of Scripture to the Middle Ages. The monastery of Lérins was destined to

play an important role in this transmission, for it was at Lérins that monks coming from the East and other monks coming from Brittany and Ireland met each other.[64]

But there was no need for so many intermediary works. Each generation had the option of drinking at the source. It is well known that Saint Jerome would have liked, in the first flush of his enthusiasm, to busy himself with the translation of all of Origen's writings. More and more he was forced to put a damper on a project that had become too foolhardy.[65] Beginning in 380 — "in my youth" he would come to say one day by way of self-justification[66] — he translated successively the homilies on Jeremiah and Ezekiel, followed by the homilies on Isaiah, the Song of Songs, and Saint Luke. In addressing (ca. 389-392) the homilies on Saint Luke to Paula and Eustochium, he recalls to them again that not too long ago Blesilla had asked him to put into Latin "the twenty-six volumes on Matthew, the five on Luke, and the thirty-two on John." A program of this magnitude outstripped his means. Nonetheless, he continued to hope that he would arrive at the end of his translation of the works of Origen's maturity, at least: "If God gives me the strength for it," he says, "the Latin language will come to know how many riches it has been missing until now, as it begins to discover them."[67]

Other translations, undertaken somewhat later by "the most noble Rufinus,"[68] at the behest of the philosopher Macarius, the bishop of Aquileia, Chromatius, and some other friends, proved even more important historically. Much has been written concerning these translations and the degree of confidence that can be invested in them, as well as the memorable quarrel which pitted their author against the irascible Jerome. Sometimes, too, we find the whole lot of them prejudicially treated as "transpositions."[69] This is an old attitude inherited from the polemicist Jean Daillé, who evinced an almost manic, compulsive desire to prove that the writings of the Fathers could not be used in doctrinal controversies.[70] Those who have studied them closely are generally less severe with them.[71] Every time that Rufinus himself has to proffer an explanation on the subject of the liberties that he has taken he does so in the most fitting and suitable way possible. These liberties vary considerably from one work to another, and wholesale suspicion does not seem to be justified.[72] In any case, the only thing that interests us here, on account of its historical influence, is the Latin version of Origen. It may be that the entire significance that the initiative of Rufinus, this man who was so educated and so modest,[73] was destined to have for the development of Christian thought and western culture has not been fully measured.[74] In 398 he had already

translated the *Periarchôn*. By the year 404, he had succeeded in translating the homilies on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Joshua, and Judges, as well as nine homilies on the Psalms, not to mention the *Ecclesiastical History* by Eusebius. Around 404 he published a Latin adaptation of the commentary on the Letter to the Romans, followed shortly thereafter by an adaptation of the commentary on the Song of Songs.

But times became hard. After an initial alarm in 406, Italy was invaded in 408 by Alaric, and its provinces were laid waste one after another. Rome was threatened. "What great disasters are being visited on the whole world!" exclaimed Saint Augustine from a distance.[75] With Melania and the Valerii, Rufinus took refuge in Campania with their friend Paulinus of Nola. Soon they were forced to flee as far as Sicily. On August 24, 410, Rome fell. Shortly after that, Nola was destroyed. Having grown old, with his eyesight failing, and assisted by his two faithful secretaries, Ursacius and Donatus, Rufinus still toiled, under the imminent threat of the Barbarians, to render the homilies on the Book of Numbers into Latin. How unpropitious the conditions were! "People brave the dangers of the sea in their flight, but not even in their places of exile do they live without fear."[76] Alaric's forces had reached the extreme tip of Calabria. From the villa of the Valerii the city of Rhegium could be seen all ablaze, and each day people expected to see the strait breached by the Goths. In his preface Rufinus gives the reader an explanation of the way things stood — a text that compelled the admiration even of Brochet![77] Less famous than the similar lament of Jerome writing to Marcellinus[78] or addressing his commentary on Ezekiel to Eustochium,[79] Rufinus's lament is the more moving, since he was closer to danger.

> How to find in these conditions the calm that is necessary for writing and especially for translating? . . . All the same, I have profited from nights when fear of the enemy was less menacing and permitted a brief respite, so as to console myself in our misfortunes by having recourse to work.[80]

Such tenaciousness attests to the concern that he had for his work. For him his work was not merely, as he goes on to say, "a mitigation of our exile in the world." He knew that he was obliged through his work "to open up the pathways of understanding" with respect to Scripture. Meanwhile he himself had no doubts about the extraordinary fecundity of those tragic nights. A few months later, he was dead. He had not been quite able to complete the task that he had set for himself. Still missing in the corpus

of his translations were the homilies on Deuteronomy, which had been besought by Pinianus.[81] Nevertheless, thanks to him — and, to a lesser extent, thanks to his former friend Jerome, who had been so ferociously joyful at his disappearance from the scene — a goodly part of the patristic heritage, which was soon to be lost to the East, where it was to be the object of systematic destruction,[82] was gathered together in the West, where it was to continue blossoming forth with fruit. Origen would be read, particularly on the Hexateuch and on the Song of Songs, with the same tractable diligence as Ambrose on the life of the Patriarchs and David, as Augustine on the Psalms, and as Gregory on Ezekiel and the Book of Job. From now on nobody could say, without ignoring the evidence, that "his colossal effort had not been fruitful."[83] He was destined to be, almost directly, one of the foremost educators of the Latin Middle Ages. His "vision" of the Bible and of the Christian life was destined to govern the underpinnings of its customs and methods. Together with Saint Augustine, he was destined to be "the doctor of the spiritual sense of history."[84] More than any other figure in the fields of hermeneutics, exegesis, and spirituality, he would be the grand master.[85]

CHAPTER FOUR

The Latin Origen

1. The Reading of Origen in the Middle Ages

From the very first years of the fifth century, then, the Latin world read Origen. In spite of the furious controversy that had unfolded since 394 and had not abated at all until 411, the year of Rufinus's death, the Latin world read him avidly. In Spain his work was found — albeit with some areas of concern — to be an antidote to Priscillianism.[1] In Rome, the author of the *Praedestinatus*, who endorsed Pamphilus's *Apology for Origen* and saw the errors laid to the account of the Alexandrian as just so many interpolations, spoke of "our Origen, Catholic treatise-writer, fighting against heresies and winning."[2] In the dedication to his *Opus paschale*, the poet Sedulius derived his authority from "Origen, who is a great expert in divine law."[3] Sidonius Apollinaris, writing from Gaul to "Pope" Euphronius, bishop of Autun, joined Origen "the allegorist" to Jerome "the translator" and Augustine "the dialectician" in an all-embracing panegyric: "they bring us," he said, "wheat sheaves that are heavily laden with spiritual meaning" — or: "wheat sheaves that are heavily laden with spiritual meaning, the harvested fruits of their doctrine of salvation."[4] In another letter, addressed to Donidius, he observed that this great man did not deserve the mistrust of certain critics, who called him a "perverse and fearful writer of treatises."[5] Did his doctrine not appear perfectly orthodox in these translations by Rufinus? Was the accuracy of these translations not of a higher order than that of Apuleius translating Plato or that of Cicero translating Demosthenes?[6] It is possible that in this passage Sidonius judged the matter according to an apocryphal work, the *Dialogues*

of Adamantius, which he believed to be authentic.[7] In any case, his contemporary, Faustus of Riez, who was the object of his praises, used the *De principiis,* which he read in the translation of Rufinus.[8] In the sixth century Saint Caesarius of Arles made much use of Origen's homilies, whole pages of which he transcribed for his own preaching.[9] In the last third of the century, Saint Gregory the Great, who knew little Greek, likewise profited greatly from them.[10] And it is remarkable that we find no allusion from his pen to anathemas which dated back only to the eve of the century. Gregory's commentary on the Song of Songs has many characteristics in common with Origen's. If we still had his monastic conferences on the Heptateuch in the form of his friend Claudius's "reportorial account" of them, we would be better able to judge his attitude regarding the translations of Rufinus. But these conferences may have been burned at his death, in the skirmish spoken of by John the Deacon.[11] In the same period, Licinianus of Cartagena, who corresponded by letter with Gregory, possessed in his library, in the form of "six little books," an explication of the Book of Job that Saint Hilary would have translated from the Greek of Origen.[12] But this work, which was probably not a pure and simple translation,[13] seems soon to have been lost.

Also lost were the two books of homilies on Esdras which Cassiodorus had had translated somewhat earlier by his friend, the priest Bellator, an educated, religious man, in whom he had great confidence.[14] Lost as well were four sermons on Deuteronomy,[15] as well as a number of homilies on the Books of Kings and the Paralipomena, all of these being texts that he had collected at Squillace in his "Vivarium"[16] for monks and manuscripts, where his sarcophagus was discovered some years before. These were texts which were already translations or which perhaps had never been translated.[17] But the Origenian treasure trove at Vivarium was richer yet. Around the year 540, in this villa on the Calabrian coast,[18] not far from the Sicilian villa where Rufinus had put the finishing touches on his translation of the *Homilies on the Hexateuch,* Cassiodorus himself gathered a complete collection of manuscripts, which he carefully revised.[19] Indeed, the originals of this collection, like a goodly number of other manuscripts, must have been transported in due course, from Vivarium to Latran, whose library was, from the seventh to the ninth centuries, "the great source of manuscripts for the Catholic world."[20] By the beginning of the seventh century a copy of the *Homilies* was to be found at Lyons, which at that time possessed a celebrated *scriptorium* and was to become a distribution center. The work spread rapidly throughout Gaul. Copies of it are to be discovered very early on at Fleury-sur-Loire,[21] then at Corbie,

Laon, Cologne, and Murbach. It would pass by way of Freising and Salzburg into the regions of southern Germany and Austria. The Celtic churches, which for almost two hundred years were to be one of the principal refuges of culture, were not long in getting their hands on it. At the end of the eighth century, a group of Spaniards, among them Claudius, the future bishop of Turin, recopied the homilies at Laon, which continued to be an intellectual center,[22] and even set about restoring the ancient codex which contained them. By way of Spain, where Saint Isidore read them, they even penetrated as far as Africa.[23]

Rufinus, as we have seen, had also translated the *Periarchôn*, some homilies on the Psalms, and the commentary on the Song of Songs,[24] besides publishing an abridged version of the commentary on the Letter to the Romans.[25] These various works, the latter two of which were to be found at Vivarium, were subsequently transmitted in conditions that it is impossible to reconstruct. It seems that a copy of the *De principiis*, which first belonged to a Neapolitan monastery — the convent of Saint Peter in the Castellum Lucullanum, near Naples — came, in the course of the sixth century, to Monte Cassino, where a copy was made of it.[26] As for the commentary on the Song of Songs, it must have become rather widely known only somewhat later on. In fact, at the very threshold of the tenth century, at Saint Gall, Notker the Stammerer (ca. 840-912), as well placed and well informed as he was, believed that it had not been translated. Through the good offices of Saint Jerome he recognized the exceptional value of the work and, too old to attend to the matter himself, he begged his former pupil, Salomon, the bishop of Constance, to seek out an able translator, even at high cost, who might render it into Latin or even into a "barbaric" language.[27] The homilies translated by Saint Jerome, including the homilies on the Song of Songs and on Jeremiah, which were part of the capital of Cassiodorus,[28] were for a long time diffused here, there, and everywhere, it seems, in separate, little portions. This was true, too, of the homilies on Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Saint Luke. Still other texts, although they were not always authentic, were known either by the Catenae or by Charlemagne's *Homiliarium*, which had been compiled by Paul the Deacon. In a Latin text, the latter gives six homilies that he attributes to Origen. Four of these are on the first Gospel.[29] Finally, the Commentary on Saint Matthew was also put into Latin, in a very abridged form. While the homilies are orthodox, the translator of the Commentary has slipped into it a few features that indicate an Arian tendency. He could be the same author who wrote the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, which is redolent of Origen. On both sides, a linguistic

kinship with the *Vetus latina* is in evidence. These indications, noticed by Dom Morin, give us cause to suppose that the Arianizing translator of the Commentary, like the orthodox translator (or author) of the homilies, flourished in the first half of the sixth century and lived in either southern Gaul or, more likely, northern Italy — Ravenna, to be more precise. In any case, his work did not take very long to make its way into northern France.[30]

Thus, the further penetration of Origen was accomplished in ways that for the better part remain obscure. In the ninth century "the monastic renewal to which the name of Saint Benedict of Aniane is linked" is simultaneously an "Origenian renewal." Until the beginning of the eleventh century, precise evidence is necessarily quite rare, because "very few of the manuscripts that predate this era have survived."[31] We know, however, that in the eighth and ninth centuries Origen had his place in the libraries of Laon, Beauvais, Reichenau, Saint Mesmin (Orleans), Saint Pierre de Chartres, etc. Harmut († ca. 895), who was abbot of Saint Gall, had "composed," that is to say, copied or overseen the copying of, the commentary on the Letter to the Romans, when he was prior.[32] Beginning in the eleventh century, we see a number of monasteries and cathedral churches possessing various writings of Origen, sometimes in multiple copies. His name is one of those that crop up most frequently in the catalogs, even though good scholars seem to have difficulty discerning it there.[33] He can be found at Mont Saint Michel, at Notre Dame de Paris, Saint Arnoul, Saint Claude, Wissembourg, Cologne, Saint Epvre de Toul, Saint Pierre de Gembloux, and so on. In 1026 Werner, the bishop of Strasbourg, brought the *Homilies on the Hexateuch* from Rome to enrich the library of his Chapter. In the tenth and eleventh centuries Cluny preserved at least seven volumes of Origen, a declaration of which was made by way of the following verse: "Origen connects together various distinguished doings."[34]

Saint Riquier and Saint Martin de Tournai each had four volumes of Origen. Bec and Laon had three. Lobbes had as many as eleven.[35] At the least, Gorze possessed the commentaries on the Song of Songs and the Letter to the Romans.[36] At the Italian abbey of Farfa, a volume that had been set aside preserved the homilies on Joshua,[37] which, like the Book of Joshua itself, appear to have been particularly relished, inasmuch as they had learned to regard Joshua as a prefiguration of Jesus Christ, the eternal king.[38] In 1180 a copy of this volume was bequeathed to the library of the Church of Chartres by its bishop, John of Salisbury.[39] What happened at Jumièges is instructive. When, in the tenth century, the abbey, which had

been laid waste by the Norman invasions, was reconstructed, people took care "to have copies made of Origen, along with Saint Basil and Cassian"; and when, a little later, after a fresh round of pillaging, it was necessary to restore it again, "the commentaries of Origen were transcribed"[40] anew.

At the end of the eleventh century and in the course of the twelfth, copies were multiplied everywhere. The monastery of San Giorgio in Braida, for example, had the homilies on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, as well as Isaiah and Ezekiel.[41] In 1123 Arnold, the abbot of Saint Pierre le Vif of Sens, drew up the list of chosen works that he had just had copied, in order to reconstitute the library that had burned down. In this case, the Fathers were represented by Gregory, Augustine, and Origen.[42] Under Peter the Venerable, Cluny possessed at least three copies of the commentary on the Song of Songs. Clairvaux, which was destined to set the tone of all the Cistercian foundations, held eight volumes entitled *Libri Origenis*. Outside of commentaries and homilies, these volumes contained the *De principiis* and the *Apologia* by Pamphilus.[43] Another collection, which had been constituted at that time in the monastery of Signy in six folio volumes, contained "the commentary on the Song of Songs, the second half of the commentary on Matthew, and the treatise on the Letter to the Romans, in addition to a series of homilies."[44] At this time, the catalog at Pontigny featured "all the biblical commentaries of Origen, particularly two copies of his commentary on the Song of Songs."[45] Also to be found there was his *Life* by Eusebius, detached from the *Ecclesiastical History*. Let us refer once more to the names of Saint Martial of Limoges, Maillezais en Poitou, Saint Aubin d'Angers, Saint Evroul, Marchiennes, and Saint Waast. Toward the end of the century, the cathedral at Toledo preserved an important collection of books by Origen. And Origen was the only Greek in evidence in the beautiful library of Saint Martin of Tournai, which had been reorganized not too long ago by Odo of Orleans.[46] In a letter, an anonymous author of the twelfth century asked for two works: the *Attic Nights* of Aulus Gellius and Origen's commentary on the Song of Songs.[47] The *Apologiae* of Origen by Pamphilus and by Rufinus were also widespread.

All these manuscripts, it is reasonable to suppose, did not remain unread. In the Middle Ages, Origen was "the most read of all the ancient Greek authors, in all areas of endeavor."[48] He was constantly being cited. Through Saint Jerome he was cited by the Pseudo-Jerome of the *Breviarium in Psalmos*,[49] that is to say, by Jerome's "abbreviator," who may have been the Roman deacon John, surnamed "Catellus," the man who subsequently became Pope John III.[50] He was cited by Saint Isidore of Seville,[51] by Saint

Julian of Toledo,[52] by the main Irish writers of the seventh century, notably the authors of the *De duodecim abusivis saeculi*,[53] and by the Celtic catecheses.[54] The Venerable Bede was not ignorant of him.[55] In his *Liber scintillarum*, Defensor, the monk of Ligugé, gives several texts taken from the homilies on Exodus and Leviticus, maxims that he has chosen quite well,[56] and without any inhibitions about naming their author each time ("Origen has said"[57]). "This is a valuable indication," observes Dom H. M. Rochais, "that the propaganda against Origen had not, therefore, entirely jeopardized the success of the great Alexandrian thinker."[58] For their part, the writers of the Carolingian Renaissance felt no scruples in naming him. This is what is done by Alcuin, Sedulius Scotus, Aeneas of Paris,[59] Jonah of Orleans,[60] Christian of Stavelot, Smaragdus, Paschasius Radbertus, Amalarius, Hincmar, Godescalc of Orbais,[61] and Hildemar. Claudius of Turin[62] and Rabanus Maurus[63] mention him many a time among the main sources of their vast compilations. Rabanus Maurus shows the high value he places on him when he expresses his regret at having found only fourteen of the forty-five homilies in which Origen is said to have commented on Jeremiah translated. But these fourteen, he assures us, were very useful to him, and he is pleased at having been able to complete them by a number of other passages relating to the text of the prophet, passages that have been gleaned from other works of the great commentator.[64] The books on the Letter to the Romans and the homilies on Exodus are cited several times as authoritative texts by the Councils of Paris in 825 and 829. Similarly, one of the homilies on Leviticus is cited by a provincial council of 836.[65] Alvarus of Cordoba and his correspondent, John of Spain, know most of the translations by Rufinus, at the very least.[66]

After this, Origen is cited again by Aimo of Auxerre. He is also cited by Atto of Vercelli[67] and by Angelome of Luxeuil, who has himself certainly read his homilies on Genesis by way of the translation by Rufinus.[68] Somewhat later on, he is cited by Sigebert of Gembloux,[69] by Manegold of Lautenbach,[70] and by the author of the *Dialog on the Roman Pontificate*.[71] In the twelfth century, he is cited by Hugh of Saint Victor, by the *Sententiae Anselmi*, by Geoffrey of Auxerre,[72] by Peter Lombard, both in his *Sentences* and in his commentary on the Pauline Letters,[73] as well as by the Abelardian author who wrote a commentary on all of Saint Paul.[74] He is cited by Gerhoh of Reichersberg in the same breath as Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, Leo, and Gregory.[75] What is more, he is cited by Andrew[76] and Richard of Saint Victor,[77] by Zachary of Besançon,[78] Philip of Harvengt, Peter Comestor,[79] Peter Cantor, Odo of Ourscamp, Herbert of Boscham, Baldwin of Canterbury, Garnier of Rochefort, and others. He is also cited

by the *Summa "totus homo,"*[80] by Master Simon,[81] and by the "Madrid" treatise.[82] He was to be cited by Giraldus de Barri,[83] Guiard of Laon, Robert Grosseteste,[84] and others. Peter Abelard and William of Saint Thierry, those two great adversaries, concur in mentioning Origen as one of their main authorities. Abelard follows him step by step in his commentary on the Letter to the Romans. Similarly, Abelard calls upon his testimony in the *Scito teipsum*[85] and takes him into consideration as early as in his prologue to the *Sic et non.*[86] As for William, he esteems Origen as the equal of Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory the Great, citing him about fifty times, at least. His *Golden Letter* and his explication of the Letter to the Romans owe much to Origen.[87] It has been possible to write that the thought of Origen exercised an increasing influence over that of William.[88]

It also happened that Origen was sometimes cited under Jerome's name, as was the case with Rabanus Maurus[89] and the *Sententiae Florianenses.*[90] So, too, with Paul Alvarus and John of Spain for the commentary on the Letter to the Romans[91] or with Goscelin of Saint Bertin, whose *Liber confortatorius* gives lengthy extracts from "Jerome's twenty-six homilies on Joshua."[92] A passage from Origen's second homily on the Song of Songs circulated under Ambrose's name.[93] On the other hand, works are sometimes attributed to him when in fact the author is someone else.[94]

Much more often, Origen is copied, summarized, amplified, adapted, or plagiarized, sometimes in the most massive way. Such was already the case, we know, in the works of ancient writers like Jerome or Cassian. The same was true in Victor of Capua's *Responsorum capitula,*[95] in the compilation of John the Deacon,[96] and in the biblical commentaries of Isidore of Seville — not to mention Saint Gregory, who is always personal even when he imitates, and too personal ever to do much imitating. The same situation pertained, more or less directly, in the commentaries of Bede, and even more in those of Rabanus Maurus, of Claudius of Turin,[97] of Walafrid Strabo, of Smaragdus,[98] of Angelome, of Pseudo-Bede on Genesis, and of Remi of Auxerre. In writing against their compatriot Elipandus, the two Spaniards Heterius and Beatus systematically develop the analogy of the triple elements of man and the threefold meanings of Scripture, as Origen had proposed it.[99] This work of violent controversy has some strange Origenian resonances that are out of the ordinary. Sedulius Scottus appropriates large blocks of the commentary on the Letter to the Romans. He goes so far as to reproduce, word for word, a phrase in which Origen, speaking in the first person, gives the opinion that the Hermas mentioned by Saint Paul is the author of the *Pastor* and that this work is divinely

inspired.[100] Paschasius Radbertus makes ample use of the commentary on Saint Matthew in his own commentary. The author of the *De 42 mansionibus filiorum Israël* closely follows his twenty-seventh homily on Numbers.[101] Although it is possible that he uses intermediaries, Saint Peter Damian does a great deal of borrowing from Origen both in his opuscula and in his correspondence. A grand letter to Hildebrand, for example, reproduces all the essential aspects of the twenty-seventh homily on Numbers, and in its detailed interpretations, sometimes providing a summary and at other times developing an idea, it follows by turns Origen and Jerome (letter to Fabiola), or more often still, juxtaposes the two of them.[102] A chapter of Damian's eighteenth opusculum is hardly more than a summary of the seventh homily on Exodus.[103] In a sermon which seems to be that of Hervaeus of Villefosse (†1187) there appears a fragment of Origen's first homily on Genesis.[104] Whether or not they got it by way of John Scotus, Godfrey of Saint Victor and others owe their anthropological explication of the account of creation to Origen.[105] Saint Bruno of Segni, Rupert of Deutz, Godfrey of Admont, Raoul of Saint Germer, Gerhoh of Reichersberg, and Werner of Saint Blaise, each in his own way, draw abundantly on his exegetical works. The *Glossa ordinaria* is quite filled to the brim with Origen. In the absence of a critical edition, it is not possible to see the exact measure of its borrowings.[106] But the general effect is not in doubt. *The Gloss of Exodus*, attributed with a fair bit of probability to Gilbert the Universal, is an almost uninterrupted string of citations or adaptations of Origen, and Gilbert makes no bones about it.[107]

Saint Bernard himself also cites Origen on occasion,[108] and already in the *Brevis commentatio*, that first sketch for the sermons on the Song of Songs,[109] he made several borrowings from him. We know that Saint Bernard often took his inspiration from Origen in his preaching. He was struck so forcibly by Origen's beautiful commentary on Lamentations 4:20 ("Under his shadow we shall live among the nations") that he took it up on his own account at least seven times.[110] In his second homily, "Super Missus est," where he attempts to explain why Joseph planned to send Mary away even though he did not believe that she was at fault, he develops a passage from "Origen's" homily on Matthew 1:18-25, which appeared in Paul the Deacon's homiliary and which had already been utilized in part by Rabanus Maurus.[111] Oftentimes, in order to explicate the Song of Songs, he follows Origen step by step. Most of the time, "he does not criticize him, he does not refute him. He does not even cite him. He simply takes his inspiration from him, and, more or less consciously, he imitates him. He not only preaches *on* him, but *like* him. They share the

same theories . . . the same conception of the relationship between the Old and New Testaments, the same allegorical exegesis, and, above all, the same imagination. . . ."[112] The parallel could be pursued and justified with many a detail. Thus it is that Saint Bernard's celebrated formula on the measure of the love of God has its origin, directly or indirectly, in Origen's commentary on the Song of Songs.[113] Geoffrey of Auxerre praises Bernard for having done for his generation what Origen had done in times gone by. This is a way of praising both of them at once.[114] Numerous collections of "Garlands from Bernard,"[115] which have been studied by Dom Jean Leclercq,[116] contain sentences from Origen. Certain collections might just as well have been entitled "Garlands from Origen,"[117] a title that is indeed borne by some of them. In certain manuscripts "the texts of Origen and the texts of Bernard have a strong resemblance to one another — so much so that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between them."[118] If confusion is possible, it is doubtless because, in these cases, the texts in question are not very elaborate and relatively impersonal, and the genius of Saint Bernard has not left its full imprint on them. Even so, it is no less true that they constitute a major, incontestable sign of the influence of Origen. In pointing out this influence, Etienne Gilson has made the following very apt remarks regarding the work of St. Bernard himself: "Let us not force anything, especially in dealing with the man who never ceased repeating that . . . in the end everyone ought to drink the water from his own well."[119] Even so, is it not quite remarkable that to buttress this recommendation of his, in which he staked his claim on the concept of originality, Bernard had recourse to a biblical text that had already been used in a similar way by Origen?[120]

Illustrious though it is, the case of Saint Bernard is merely one among many. Although his disciple, Aelred of Rievaulx, for example, does not cite Origen's name, he shows, at least, that he is well aware of his thought. His whole conception of biblical mystery "betrays" Origen's influence "much too closely to allow one to suppose that he himself had not also borrowed it from the source itself."[121] We know, moreover, that he had some of Origen's works available to him in the abbey library. Everywhere in the Latin Middle Ages, we recognize Origen's teaching on Scripture, on the reading of Scripture in the Church,[122] on Scripture's relationship with the profane disciplines, on the fellowship of "philosophers" with "heretics,"[123] on faith and understanding,[124] on the pairing of "lectio" with "oratio,"[125] etc. Everywhere we see his hermeneutical principles. Everywhere we see his exegetical influence.[126] Everywhere we recognize his great symbols: the well of the Patriarchs,[127] the water of Marah, the ark

with double and triple casing, the shadow of Christ,[128] two Cities,[129] Cana, Transfiguration, etc. Numerous themes of medieval spirituality are based on his interpretations,[130] themes that range from a certain idea of conscience,[131] of the "crowning point of the mind,"[132] of "ordered charity,"[133] or of the relationship between divine image and likeness, all the way through to the notion that the soul conceives and gives birth each day by means of the Word or receives the Word into her bosom.[134] Origen's homilies on Numbers, the famous twenty-seventh homily in particular, which was imitated freely by Saint Jerome in his long letter to Fabiola, established the theme of the "spiritual journey," the "crossing of the desert," and the stages of the interior life.[135] From Origen comes the doctrine of the spiritual meanings of the soul.[136] His description of the spiritual warfare that follows on Jesus, which is signified by the wars of the Old Testament, has become one of the great commonplaces of the tradition:[137] "in all of divine history, exterior warfare signifies the interior warfare of the soul."[138] From Origen, moreover, through Saint Gregory and Saint Bernard, there flows that deep-seated tradition which requires that God alone should be a perfectly pure spirit "without any sort of an association with a corporeal addition,"[139] etc. Origen's explication of three gospel texts[140] is one of the main sources of medieval devotion to the Heart of Jesus, although sometimes, perhaps, it is filtered through Saint Ambrose or Saint Augustine.[141] When, in two of his homilies, Godfrey of Admont (†1165) shows the Apostle John resting on the Savior's bosom, explaining in the first instance that "in this bosom can be found the heart of man, and in this heart, in turn, can be found wisdom,"[142] and, in the second instance, that "this bosom is Holy Scripture, in which is hidden the spiritual sense that enlivens man, in which he imbibes knowledge of the Heart of God,"[143] he is echoing Origen.[144] Already these echoes had resounded frequently elsewhere: for example, in Ambrose Autpert,[145] in a sequence of Notker the Stammerer,[146] in other liturgical poems,[147] in Saint Peter Damian,[148] and in Rupert.[149] There were also resonances in Saint Bernard,[150] in Gerhoh of Reichersberg,[151] and in Adam of Saint Victor.[152] In the not too distant future these echoes would be resounding as well in the works of Philip of Harvengt,[153] Saint Gertrude,[154] and Alexander Neckam.[155] By reproducing some elements of this Origenian theme in the past, Saint Jerome had, so to speak, "demystified" or rather "demysticized" it.[156] But the tradition, well inspired in this respect, preferred the original theme, which the writers of hymns would continue to use.[157]

It is, moreover, Origen's commentary on the Song of Songs that established the mystical interpretation of this book once and for all. By "mys-

tical" here is meant the double meaning of the word, both exegetical and spiritual. This was the interpretation that was so profoundly incorporated into the tradition of the Church. Later developments, such as Marian interpretations, which flourished in the twelfth century but whose principle had been set down in an explicit way a long time before,[158] presuppose this interpretation as their unchangeable foundation. Marian theology, which would be enriched by these events, is equally indebted to Origen, as can be seen in Rupert especially.[159] From Origen, too, there come the notions of "ecstatic love," "the blessed fire of love," and "the wound of love,"[160] "the sweet fragrances of which the Cistercian and Franciscan Middle Ages would one day use exhaustively."[161] It is remarkable that in dealing with "lectio divina" Petrus Cellensis seems to condense it into his reading of the Hexateuch. This manner of proceeding bears the stamp of Origen and provides one more indication of the extraordinary historical importance of the homilies translated by Rufinus.[162] The same influence can be felt everywhere, even beyond direct allusions and borrowings: in the vocabulary, in the phrasing, in the way things developed, and in the spiritual atmosphere. Often the influence can even be tracked, as we see a given passage from Origen being directly transmitted all the way down the line, beginning with a first utilization of it. Some of Origen's exegesis, which the Greek tradition does not seem to have retained, spanned the whole Latin tradition, as Henri-Charles Puech has shown in the case of the trinitarian interpretation of Psalm 50:12-14.[163] Other examples will be seen in the course of this work.

We have pointed out Saint Isidore of Seville as one of the first authors to cite Origen. Isidore does not rest content with marveling merely at the critical labors of the Alexandrian, as he does in the sixth book of his *Etymologies*.[164] At the beginning of his *Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum* he acknowledges his debt to Origen's exegesis, along with the exegetical labors of Augustine and Gregory. Jean Châtillon has patiently analyzed this work and researched its sources and its influence.[165] In it Isidore transcribes or summarizes numerous texts from Origen, texts taken principally from the homilies on the Hexateuch, chiefly Exodus, Joshua, and Judges. To be sure, in his commentary on Joshua, Origen is just about his only source. Now these *Quaestiones* were destined to enjoy an enormous success. Indeed, Bede made an abridgement of them.[166] An anonymous exegete, probably Carolingian, uses them freely. Another exegete reproduced whole sections of them. Claudius of Turin and Remigius of Auxerre frequently took their inspiration from them for their commentaries on Genesis, while Saint Bruno of Segni did so for the whole of the Pentateuch.

Richard of Saint Victor knew them. In different places Rabanus Maurus has recopied the Origen of Rufinus and the Origen of Rufinus-Isidore. The *Glossa ordinaria* depends on Origen in at least three ways: at times it reproduces Rufinus's Origen directly, at other times it reproduces copies or summaries that Isidore has made of him, and at still other times it reproduces the passages from Rabanus which were by and large reproductions of Isidore. . . . Thus, although it may have been by the agency merely of this single collection compiled by a Spaniard in the seventh century, Origen's exegesis was destined "to traverse the centuries and contribute to the formation of the medieval soul."[167] Like the servant at Cana spoken of by Saint Bruno of Segni, Origen himself more often than not remains unnamed, but the wine that he pours is drunk by all and judged to be delicious.[168] This explains, to quite a large extent, how, in the area of exegesis and religious thought, there are so many features held in common by the two great medieval "renaissances," that of the ninth century and that of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. This discovery contributes to a unification of the vast period within which the object of our study is situated. Throughout the radical transformations or slow evolutions that take place from the fifth century to the thirteenth, the reading and constant use of the translations of Origen constitute one of the elements that assure a continuity.

2. The Twofold Equation

What an astonishing fate! Comparable in many ways to the fate of Dionysius, that other Greek. Dionysius has been surnamed "the first of the men of the West." It has been said that he was "the most Latin of the Eastern Fathers."[1] Certainly he could share these titles with Origen. The two of them are similar in "having become Western by adoption." In both cases, their work has had more effect through Latin translations than through the original text. The writings of both men "are an inexhaustible mine for all who seek to describe the ascent of the soul to God."[2] If many Latin writers have celebrated "the great Dionysius,"[3] others, we shall see, have lavished praise on "the great Origen." They have shared, thus, a comparable fate — but, for all that, a curiously opposite one as well. The writings of Dionysius were launched on their prodigious career within the West at roughly the same time as those of Origen (beginning in the sixth century). The content of this "corpus" of work, which was difficult, at least, to reconcile with the dominant Augustinianism, could well have

appeared somewhat suspect.[4] Did not John Scotus, himself, who was his principal interpreter, and who praised Dionysius emphatically, confess that he was "obscure, quite divorced from modern feelings and opinions, and intractable to the vast majority of people"?[5] Furthermore, Latin sensibilities, coupled with the concerns raised now and again by John Scotus, ran the risk of coming into play against him. But the prestigious name of the Athenian disciple of Saint Paul — and his accession, moreover, at the time of Hilduin, to become the first bishop at once of both Athens and Paris — forestalled any criticism in advance and exacted an attitude of absolute confidence. Beginning in the time of Saint Gregory and Saint Martin I, this state of affairs was enhanced by the renewed praises of the papacy.[6] Then, in the ninth century, we have the twin recommendations of the emperors of East and West.[7] Finally there was the patronage of the not very commendable, though learned and all-powerful, Anastasius, in the person of whom the accents of the Holy See itself could be heard.[8] Dionysius had the unique distinction of being commented on in the same way as the sacred authors. For Origen, the opposite was the case. His homilies appeared "marvelous," his explication of the Psalter carried the day in triumph,[9] his exegetical method had supplied "the very foundations and substance of theological thought,"[10] and what remained of his work had already entered "to a great extent into the anonymous edifice of theological tradition."[11] Now, despite all this, the suspect reputation of the author was always inciting fresh waves of mistrust, which no glorious legend, no official support, came on the scene to neutralize. Furthermore, this same Anastasius who, from Rome, had "launched" Dionysius as Latinized by John Scotus, had also done everything he could to blacken the memory of Origen in the mind of the Latins.[12]

Nevertheless, unquestioned confidence was not enough to effect the universal imposition of an author who showed himself to be "inadequately biblical," whereas all the burden of mistrust was bound to be powerless, in the long term, against "the irresistible attraction" exercised by the prince of commentators.[13]

On the one hand, therefore, we have the following fact: the entire western tradition is witness to an "extraordinary interest" in the works of Origen. They enjoyed an immense popularity.[14] Aldhelm of Canterbury admired Origen unreservedly, although he did so especially on account of Origen's profane learning and his incomparable mastery "of nearly all the philosophical disciplines."[15] Isidore of Seville sings his praises many a time in both prose and verse.[16] He was, for Saint Julian of Toledo,[17] as he was afterward for Rabanus Maurus,[18] for Regino of Prüm,[19] and for

still others, a "doctor." Indeed, Fréculfe of Lisieux speaks of him as a "distinguished doctor."[20] The author of the *Chronicle* of Würzburg describes him as "the most distinguished doctor."[21] In the eyes of Saint Benedict of Aniane, he is a saint, one of the great models of monastic life, together with Jerome and Gregory.[22] Notker the Stammerer, who is so subtle and refined in his judgments, lavishes him with the most laudatory of epithets.[23] Humbert, who corresponded with Rabanus Maurus, puts him first on his list of "Fathers."[24] Claudius of Turin puts him at the head of his list of "our doctors and forefathers."[25] John Scotus, whose devotion is not limited to Dionysius, celebrates "the great Origen, most diligent seeker after reality,"[26] and he may intend the title of his *De divisione naturae* to be reminiscent of the title of Origen's *De principiis*.[27] The designation "the great Origen" was common at the time.[28] "Origen is water from the sea," says a letter of the ninth century, as if to give an idea of his inexhaustible abundance.[29] A library inscription that dates from the same era celebrates the immensity of his work:

> After this came Origen, well-known for his keenness and zeal,
> Famous expositor, with his ready Greek eloquence:
> The richly laden pages were not esteemed to be of mean and common value,
> He insisted on diversifying them with a great many different styles in Greek.
> Jerome, however, was not in any wise able to undertake this laborious effort. . . .[30]

Taking up a saying of Didymus the Blind, a saying that Saint Jerome had rendered famous when he made it his own,[31] Guibert of Nogent saw him as the great master of doctrine after the Apostles.[32] Abelard, who was not content to regard him only as one of the "principal doctors," thought that this "zealous digger of spiritual wells"[33] was "the greatest of the Christian philosophers."[34] William of Saint Thierry compares him unreservedly to Saint Ambrose and to Saint Augustine.[35] So does Stephen of Rouen. Hugh of Saint Victor gives him a place — which is, curiously enough, between Isidore and Bede — in the "third rank" of his canon of inspired writers.[36] Berenger the Scholastic, who adds his sharp, piercing voice to this unanimous chorus of regard, has him appear as one of the members of the "four-horse chariot" that is comprised of the best commentators on the Song of Songs.[37] Although he did so without any kind of benevolent intention, Fulco recognized without demurral that Origen's

"high wisdom" was proclaimed everywhere.[38] Geoffrey of Auxerre, who was secretary and then biographer of Saint Bernard, admired "Origen's genius," which he seemed to place above that of any other, and obligingly reproduced Saint Jerome's most eulogistic remarks about him.[39] Nicholas of Clairvaux, who was for some time another secretary and confidant of Saint Bernard, declared that no tongue had glorified the "dear and glorious" name of Jesus more nobly than had Origen's.[40] And it is more than likely that in this regard he appropriates a reflection that comes from Bernard himself.[41] John, the excellent abbot of Saint Mary of Transtevere, cites a poem whose author calls upon Origen in the following terms: "And you, what do you think, Origen, renowned doctor that you are?"[42]

Petrus Cellensis praises his "exceedingly sweet eloquence."[43] Thomas of Perseigne has a connoisseur's appreciation of the quality of his "honey."[44] Peter Lombard regards him as one of the great doctors whose authority is indispensable. Also, since an assertion by Saint Gregory the Great appears to contradict an assertion by Origen, he follows the method that was typical at that time and gives a "liberal" interpretation not of Origen, but of Gregory, so as to harmonize Gregory with Origen.[45] Peter Cantor cites the magnificent panegyric that Eusebius delivers on both the words and life of Origen.[46] John of Salisbury confers some splendid titles on him: "keenest of philosophers, most literate of Christians, and most fervent in his faith."[47] He invokes his testimony on a par with that of Jerome and Augustine.[48] Gerald of Wales does likewise. He admires his exceedingly useful works, "which are still extant and enlighten many people,"[49] and places him in the ranks of the doctors who have done great honor to the Bride of Christ.[50] Herbert of Bosham is equally emphatic:

> First of all, let there be added that greatest and most venerable interpreter of the Scriptures, I mean Origen, who . . . toiled with much thought over his explanations of the divine laws more than a hundred and fifty years before Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and the rest of the interpreters of sacred letters. Without a model and without an associate, he was the first to teach thoroughly how much was possible regarding these sacred letters.[51]

Similar also were the words of Alexander Neckam, at the point when, during his inspection of the most famous cities, he comes to praise Tyre:

> Tyre is a famous and much-spoken of city, which Alexander
> Conquered at great expense and with serious toil.

But the huge glory of Origen makes the city glorious;
The body of such a great doctor honors Tyre.[52]

On all sides we find a celebration in lyrical terms of his immense labor and his incomparable knowledge of the Scriptures.[53] He is fondly designated by his other name, Adamantius, "man of adamantine hardness,"[54] which is considered a surname given to him after the fact,[55] so vividly does it appear fated to signify not only his indefatigable ardor and the invincible brightness and power of his mind, but also the firmness of his faith and of his character in the profession of his faith.[56] From century to century the following sketch was passed on: "The words of Origen are weighed and examined on account of his pithy morality and the abundance of his corroborative authorities."[57] Gratitude is shown to him for having spoken so well of Jesus. It is repeated, in prose and in verse, in the wake of Saint Jerome, that after having surpassed all the doctors in his other commentaries, Origen surpassed his own self in commenting on the Song of Songs:

It was Origen alone, who, when he had outdone all the learned doctors
In his other books, finally outdid himself
Through the book of Solomon, when he commented on Solomon's
Song of Songs.[58]

From at least the time of Charlemagne, who prescribed the use of the homiliary of Paul the Deacon in the liturgy,[59] right to the time of Saint Pius V,[60] his homilies — although not always authentic — were read at the Divine Office.[61] They are "the shining glory of the Church."[62] Toward the end of the twelfth century, according to the testimony of Jean Béleth, Origen was one of the four great suppliers of homilies, together with Augustine, Gregory, and Bede.[63] In several monasteries, notably Clairvaux and Saint Victor of Paris, Origen was also read in the refectory, in alternation with Saint Gregory and Saint Augustine, after Holy Scripture.[64]

Meanwhile, however, there were times when his "madness" came under discussion.[65] This was not merely with a view to recalling the heroic gesture that was born of an ill-considered zeal — a gesture that is constantly alluded to, but toward which the attitude turns out, like Saint Jerome's,[66] to be rather indulgent,[67] even while it is declared that measures of this nature are more to be admired than imitated.[68] It was rather on account of his teaching that the notion of his "madness" entered into play. No one dared to count him among the "Catholic doctors," His various affirmations were made subject to a careful combing.[69] Sometimes people

went so far as to range him among the heretics and pagan philosophers — him who had done so much to combat both these groups.[70] He was put in the company of Aristotle and poor Priscian, who, like him, was the victim of an historical error.[71] He was considered "reprehensible in many matters."[72] His "impious dogmas,"[73] his "unprecedented blasphemies,"[74] and "the perversity of his errors"[75] were condemned. From these errors even catalogs of a sort were set up, in imitation of Saint Jerome.[76] Now it must be said that these were not always or even usually contradictory judgments emanating from two schools or from two opposite tendencies. Probably it happened that in an argument an appeal was made to the authority of Origen, "that renowned doctor,"[77] and that the other person responded that he was not intimidated by "that old heretic," who had been "condemned by the Fathers" long ago.[78] But it also happened that both extremes of praise and censure could be seen issuing from the same pen, in the middle of the same passage of text. It was possible to see a mingling of enthusiasm and reservation in the mind of the same reader. On the subject of Origen, which was like no other, there was a pervasive spirit of perplexing ambiguity.

The contradiction could be avoided, it is true, with an easy distinction. Herbert of Bosham formulated it in nostalgic terms: "Would that we had accepted him as a Catholic dogmatist quite as much as we admire him as a faithful interpreter!"[79] The distinction came from Saint Jerome, who, when he was obliged to proffer his own justification, had in different ways declared, somewhat untruthfully, that: "I praised the interpreter, not the theologian; the philosopher, not the apostle."[80] Was this distinction, however, not as artificial as it was facile? Was Jerome not well aware of this, when he advanced other defensive schemes?[81] A "faithful interpreter" could easily have made some false steps. But how, at the same time, could he be so culpable? Besides, was there not quite often a dependence on his doctrine? Was theology not, in fact, identically the science of Scriptures? Praising the interpreter did not mean that reference was made only to his critical erudition. It meant that one talked of his homilies and his commentaries, not of the *Hexapla* or the scholia. Was it not, in fact, this interpreter of the Scriptures who was said to have reeled and staggered "from an excess of fervor whereby he mingled his own feelings with the profound depths of the Holy Scriptures, which he loved."[82]

How, therefore, are we to understand that so faithful an interpreter of all the Scriptures had at the same time corrupted them, to the point of becoming a heterodox purveyor of doctrine? And, as Rufinus had long before objected to Jerome: "Who that was once a Master of the Churches

could be said to have been a heretic?"[83] Some, therefore, simply refused to believe in this deep-seated heterodoxy on the part of Origen. They would formulate arguments in his defense: one such production is a "Defence of Origen," while another is a "Justification of Origen."[84] Sometimes certain passages from his homilies that concern those who have been unjustly excommunicated would be cited on a par with other texts from Gregory, Jerome, and Augustine. And the mere fact of having recourse to his writings is a good proof that their author was not considered a reprobate.[85] On his debit side, however, there are a certain number of opinions known or thought to be known, that are generally considered to be his, and which merit condemnation. He wrote so much! In this massive body of work that is so useful and worthy of praise, a few remarks creep in, "which the Catholic Faith has rejected as pernicious and very deserving of condemnation."[86]

On the subject of penance, for example, there are one or two enigmatic texts. One is to be found in the homily on Ezekiel[87] and another in a homily on Leviticus. But if some reprove him for them, others explain these texts in terms of an acceptable meaning and see them merely as a factual testimony to the discipline that held sway in the Church at that time.[88] Except that there are graver errors: those of the *Periarchôn*, a catalog of which we have in Saint Jerome's lengthy letter to Avitus.[89] In the first place, we have this "blasphemy," this affirmation "coming from a sacrilegious tongue," about the Son who could not see the Father and about the Spirit who could not see the Son,[90] and also about the Spirit who would not be of the substance of the Father and the Son.[91] There is, further, his famous hypothesis about the heavenly origin of souls, which makes angels of them.[92] There is his idea of interiorizing all the punishments suffered by sinners by reducing "the fire and worms" to the sorrowful consciousness of their offenses.[93] There are his "poisonous arguments about the Scriptures,"[94] as Saint Jerome says, alleging that he denies "the truth of the resurrection."[95] Again, there is his way of interpreting Saint Paul so as to make, in actual fact, all creatures groan by submitting all of them, including man himself, to "vanity," ranging from inanimate matter — precisely because he believes it to be animated — right to the angels.[96] This interpretation of Saint Paul is a delicate point, and Saint Jerome, who is in other respects fairly unsettled and changeable,[97] had not been alone in reproaching Origen with it. Saint Augustine, when consulted on this subject by Paulus Orosius, did not wish to pronounce himself in a categorical way, but it can be clearly seen that his personal thought inclined to an opposite meaning.[98] Despite Ambrose, Cassiodorus, and Isidore of Seville, who had conceded the animation of the stars as being

at least very plausible,[99] the Middle Ages in general abounded with the Augustinian sense of things: "All of creation, which is to say, man, in whom every kind of created thing is to be found."[100] Earlier, Licinianus of Cartagena, who was less cautious than Augustine, had reproached the Alexandrian for his interpretation on the grounds that at the very least it was foolish nonsense.[101] Peter Lombard saw it as an idea at once "silly and impious."[102] Lastly there is Origen's belief, as is often repeated, in an infinite recurrence of cosmic cycles,[103] based on the supposition that, after the reign of the just predicted by the Book of Revelation, everything was bound to start all over again forever. Some claim that he says that this will happen after a thousand years,[104] while others claim that he sets the time period at a hundred thousand years.[105] Or else, we have, on the other hand, his belief in the ultimate salvation of all beings, even the devil. This latter opinion is mentioned most often, since it is the one that causes most scandal. In fact, it cannot be found anywhere, except in a passage where the supposed reading is: "some passible divinity or other suffers again in the air for the redemption [of demons]."[106] Most critics, however, have no doubt but that he held to this notion. Already a short while after the time of Saint Jerome, who had denounced the idea persistently,[107] an ancient chronicle recalled it in harsh terms.[108] To "the followers of Origen"[109] Bede opposes a sentence from the Book of Proverbs (2:19): "None who go to her come back."[110] Rabanus Maurus draws on another sentence from the same book to make a direct objection to Origen: "Once an impious man is dead, there is no more hope."[111] Against him, Remi of Auxerre also adduces the unanimous opinion of the Holy Fathers.[112] Werner of Saint Blaise notes that, contrary to Judas and the devil, who overturned their vessel on its port side when they despaired of divine mercy, Origen overturned his on the starboard side by an excess of confidence.[113] This explanation, the essence of which comes from Saint Gregory[114] and which is on the whole benign, can be found in a sermon of Geoffrey Babion.[115] "Origen is in error when he warrants salvation for bad men and even demons after the passage of many years," says Robert Puyllen.[116] In his *Christian Theology*, Abelard himself briskly rejects "this detestable error, which extends salvation even to the demons."[117] This is where Origen's "Platonic doctrine" lies, this is where his "monstrous words and depraved arguments, not Christian doctrines" are to be found, pronounces Arnold of Bonneval.[118] And it is precisely to this purpose that in his preaching Peter Comestor exclaims: "Do not believe the dogmatizing Origen!"[119]

So there we have a great many complaints. Do they suffice, however, to put an end to all the perplexities that beset the minds of so many? Do

they adequately take into account the words of Saint Jerome, which were taken up directly, in the main, by Sulpicius Severus,[120] and then by Vincent of Lérins,[121] words which were hearkened to and repeated ever more frequently from the time of Cassiodorus on:[122] "When he did things well, there was no one better; when he did things badly, there was no one worse"?[123]

In fact, this designation of "worse"[124] is often given an even worse connotation. There is no very precise idea at stake, because it is spoken of by hearsay. Origen's worst folly, the one which, once it is revealed, causes the disquieting texts of the *De principiis* or even some passages from the homilies to be given the worst possible construction, is not to be found in the homilies or even in the *De principiis.* Not by a long way.[125] More than one reader, moreover, is ready to follow Rufinus and heed a complaint voiced by Origen himself[126] and thus to think that the text could have been interpolated by heretics or malevolent figures.[127] Did not Sulpicius Severus[128] and Vincent of Lérins,[129] neither of whom in other respects had any real knowledge of the question at stake, acknowledge this, by way of hypothesis at least? Others suppose the supposition is that in these texts Origen is reporting certain opinions without making them his own, or, at least, that, if he has happened to express some errors, "he did not arrive at a decisive judgment about them, but merely proffered his opinion in discussion."[130] Is this not a declaration that he made himself?[131] Others, who might not be at all convinced by these arguments, would nonetheless be ready to excuse him, without, however, feeling the need to resort to subtle theories on dogmatic development, since they imagined that he lived in the third century, "five hundred years before Ambrose and Jerome," and that in his prodigious effort at understanding the Scriptures he found himself to be "the very first, without an example to follow, and all alone, without a colleague."[132] Finally, do not the most holy doctors, the very ones from whom the Church takes her official readings, have "some bad and heretical elements"[133] in their writings? Hervaeus of Bourg Déols, who makes this remark, adds that the prudent reader will clearly see the truth of his observation.[134] For all that, there is no condemnation of these doctors or their books. Why, then, do Origen's errors pose such a particular problem? It is because, when one deals with Origen, one encounters evidence of a kind that cannot be rejected out of hand, whose content is so heavy and oppressive that one risks remaining dumbfounded by it.

If the criticisms formulated by Saint Augustine or even by Saint Jerome did not come into play, the matter would not, indeed, be so serious. Augustine let it be readily understood either that he had only an indirect

knowledge of the question[135] or, later, that he did not approve of all the bad things that were being spoken about Origen. And in the advice that he addressed to Paulus Orosius in 415 he took care not to attribute to the master himself the concatenation of errors that was being labelled as "Origenist."[136] More grievous was the testimony of Saint Jerome, which was eagerly cited for that very reason by Gautier of Saint Victor, an integrist.[137] His widely read tract against Rufinus made a long-lasting impression.[138] It was in showering praise on Jerome that some critics found that they were led naturally to confuse Origen with the worst of heretics — that is to say, Origen, along with his defender Rufinus. Thus, in the first years of the twelfth century, we have Reginald of Canterbury inserting a "praise of Jerome"[139] into his epic poem on Saint Malchus:

> . . . The mad enemies of our dogma and our faith, of our peace and tranquility —
> Jovinianus, Arrius and Photinus, Origen and Rufinus —
> They all fear him.
> Whoever is punished by you, Jerome, does not escape unscathed!
> You put an end to savage contagion with the sharp edge of your tongue. . . .[140]

On the other hand, at least, Jerome himself proffered to impartial readers the wherewithal to temper his harshest judgments. In the first place, these readers were well aware, in fact, that the fearsome polemicist's grievances hardly touch on more than the *De principiis*. Furthermore, even without knowing, as we do, that this was one of the first works of a man who lived a long life and wrote many other works, they did not fall victim to the error of perspective that certain moderns have succumbed to, insofar as they wish to see the *De principiis* as the "summa" of Origen's thought. Nor, indeed, did these readers follow Jerome in his paradoxical effort at systematization by which, as is still done by moderns,[141] all the ideas of this book are reduced to constituting a boundless monism where everything is to be found confounded.[142] They do not have the naivety that causes so many of our historians to mistake the libels of the fearsome polemicist for masterpieces of good sense and moderation.[143] Finally, they are well aware that at first there was many a time when Jerome heaped "wondrous"[144] praise on Origen, calling him an "immortal genius."[145] And this was the man Jerome would afterward criticize in such strong and extensive terms, as was noted by Pelagius II, "that he scarcely seemed to be a disciple."[146] Following the lead of Sulpicius Severus, who did, on

other occasions, submit nonetheless to the contagion of Jerome's outbursts, even if they suspend their judgment out of deference toward so great a doctor of the Church,[147] they are inclined to shake their heads and say:

> I marvel that one and the same man could have been so divided in himself that in the areas of his writing that meet with approval he has no equal after the Apostles, while in the areas which are rightly censured, no one could be shown to have erred more detestably.[148]

Accordingly, they never let themselves be taken by "the jingling clatter of his invective."[149] It is probable that a certain number of them made the observation that the wise Tillemont would one day describe in detail: "Whoever had him as an adversary was almost always last among men."[150] Nor are they unaware of texts such as the letter to Pammachius and to Oceanus, in which Jerome himself, after a ringing panegyric, excuses Origen far more than he condemns him:

> But if Judas in his jealousy objects and imputes his errors to us, let him be free to hear that:
>
> Sometimes even great Homer nods off to sleep,
>
> For truly it is permissible in the course of a lengthy work to let sleep steal up on you.[151]

And they were probably not unaware of a similar, earlier declaration, according to which, if Origen, "great and distinguished man that he was,"[152] had so many enemies, this was "not because of the truth of his dogmas, not because of his heresy, which mad dogs now impute to him, but because they could not bear the glory of his eloquent knowledge, and because when he spoke, everyone else was thought to be mute and speechless."[153] Orderic was so well aware of this that he echoed it, not without malice, when, sympathizing as an historian, he linked together both Origen and Jerome, those two great men who were of old, each in his turn, exposed to the mischievous wrangling of the envious:[154]

> . . . In the complaints of the ancients we commonly read this, and we bemoan the fate of distinguished teachers, who must lament the taunts of their envious rivals. We see Jerome and Origen, and other doctors making their allegations and complaining about the gibes of those who yelp and bark their taunts.[155]

Thus Origen is pitied on the evidence of Jerome himself. Jerome is pitied like Origen, and both of them are companions in bemoaning their situation. And if, at the end, this pity of which the doctor of Caesarea is thus the object must rebound somewhat reproachfully onto the doctor from Bethlehem, the latter would have no right to complain about it. It would not be Orderic's fault either. Never was the theme of the envious, so frequent in the Middle Ages,[156] frequent to the point of being tired and worn, more ably given a new lease on life.

Except that it was not merely Jerome. People were not unaware of the declarations of the ancient councils. These declarations were certainly much better known. We have the declaration of 543 and the more important one of 553, both of which were sanctioned by Pope Vigilius. They took up the infamous terms of the texts prepared by Justinian, which are themselves an amplified, corrected, and completed echo of the passionate accusations voiced more than a century previously by Epiphanius and Theophilus. "Anathema to Origen, to his abominable, cursed, and criminal dogmas!" He mingled the pure doctrine received from the Apostles with "the insane madness of the Greeks and the Manichaeans."[157] In this way the poor Alexandrian appears forever in the official list of heresiarchs, in a jumble where the Latins have trouble recognizing themselves, in the company of Arius and Mani, Pythagoras and Plato, Sabellius and Apollinaris, Nestorius and Eutyches, or even Theodore of Mopsuestia, if not Didymus and Evagrius finally. In the profession of faith by Gennadius, it is noted that his errors are mentioned as many as five times.[158] A chapter of the "Decree" that began to circulate in the seventh century and is attributed to Pope Gelasius touched on all Saint Jerome's attacks and called Origen a "schismatic."[159] In his letter to Elias of Aquileia around the year 586, Pelagius II wrote: "Who among the heresiarchs is worse than Origen?"[160] A council held at the Lateran in 649, under Pope Martin I, renewed the verdict and stiffened it.[161] Three consecutive ecumenical councils, in the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries (680, 787, 870) solemnly confirmed it. The consecration ceremony of the Roman pontiffs was constantly recalling this verdict. Origen and his disciples were impious, and so they fell prey to a sweeping judgment "of eternal condemnation."[162] In 866 Nicholas I alluded again to this anathema.[163]

Is not all of this overwhelming? Our Latins lack the means of verification. They cannot understand the distant and complicated history of "Origenism." They cannot know, for example, that the beginnings of the dispute were "artificial," that certain accusations rest on pure misconstructions, that even texts of Origenian provenance which entered into the

preparation of the first anathemas, "fragments detached from their context, chosen intentionally to blacken the memory of the celebrated doctor," are unreliable. They do not know, or have an imperfect understanding of, the fact that the "council" of 543 is really only an edict of Justinian that the bishops of his permanent synod and the five patriarchs had to approve at the behest of the all-powerful emperor. They do not have the information that is needed to interpret the silences of Pelagius II and Gregory the Great, or even those of somebody as early as Vigilius, who spoke of the Fifth Ecumenical Council without ever mentioning Origen. It is impossible for them to surmise that the condemnation of 553, the only one which would be truly important, the one which is attributed to this Fifth Council, was merely an extraconciliar act, obtained by Justinian before the official opening of the Council, and one which does not appear in the account given of the deliberations.[164] What is more, they are not aware that the chapter of the "Decree of Gelasius" which is so harsh on Origen is the work of a private author, who did his writing far from Rome and who blindly followed Saint Jerome.[165] In the face of all this evidence, the value of which they cannot question, they no longer dare to rely on certain explications of Rufinus, even when they are quite relevant.[166] Many are ready to accept an explanation, whatever it may be, that will make the anathema intelligible to them. All of them, in any case, accept in a spirit of faith the judgment, such as it is, that each generation transmits to the one that follows. They reproduce its purport in stereotypical formulas that come from Epiphanius, Jerome, and Theophilus. Some of these formulas would gain admittance even to the Summa of Saint Thomas.[167] "A while ago, the holy council struck Origen and his followers with the bolt of anathema."[168] The "followers of Origen"[169] are a heretical sect, whose leader was Origen: as disconcerting as this statement was, it was affirmed, if not classified, beginning in the time of Isidore of Seville.[170] How can we be surprised at this, when we see that it is most probably not ecclesiastical anathemas, but rather the declarations of Justinian that are still intimidating or even seducing the scholars of the twentieth century?[171]

3. The Legend of the Fall

A legend had found currency, which even in its unlikeliness explained and harmonized everything. There are numerous indications that permit the observation of its progress through the Latin world. Its first beginnings are to be found in a concatenation of confused gossip reported for the first

time by Saint Epiphanius, a hundred and fifty years after the death of Origen. Pious and learned, but without critical instincts, Epiphanius was a passionate man with a narrow mind, "a fire-brand," says Henri Leclercq,[1] "credulous and capable of letting himself be deceived," says Tillemont.[2] Let us propose a judgment on this issue.

According to the account by Epiphanius, Origen, arrested as a Christian under Decius, was subjected to all sorts of tortures. Then he was placed on the steps of the temple of Serapis to distribute palm branches to the adorers of the god. But he boldly proclaimed to them that they should offer these palms to Christ. A fresh application of punishments was said not to have shaken his resolve. Because of his great reputation, the magistrates persisted in trying to bring about his downfall. Thus it happened that the devil suggested a hellish trick to them: if he did not sacrifice to the idols, he would be forced to submit to the violent fury of an Ethiopian.[3] A terrified Origen declared that he preferred to sacrifice. They put incense in his hand, and from his hand it was made to fall on the center of the altar.[4] Deprived in this way of the glory of martyrdom, he was driven out of the Church. This, continues Epiphanius, happened at Alexandria. In his shame and disgrace, Origen fled as far as Palestine. The renown which he had gained in the science of the Scriptures had preceded him there. Straightoff he was asked to speak in an assembly of priests. But after he read the following psalm verse: "God says to the sinner: why are you coming to proclaim my justice and why do you have my covenant on your lips?" he closed the book and broke out into sobs, at which his whole audience joined him in weeping.

The story is not finished. Or, rather, it begins anew. In Palestine, at Tyre, yielding to numerous entreaties, notably those of Ambrose, whom he had just drawn from heresy, Origen began to comment on Scripture and to compose his *Hexapla*. This two-pronged division of labor occupied him for twenty-eight years. But "when he had finished these great labors, he did not know how to preserve the glory he had gained for himself, and finally, all this vigor and abundance of doctrine became for him an occasion of ruin. Since he had not wanted to leave any text bereft of explication, he fell prey to an enormous error by making some deadly exegeses, whence was born the sect of the Origenists." Also, is it he or some other Origen who would give rise to another sect of Origenists, who were given to shameful acts? Epiphanius declares that he cannot come to a decision about this. In any case, it is indeed Origen who mutilated himself, unless it was the case that he had used some medicinal herb. And as for the marvelous things that are recounted of him, Epiphanius, sceptical for once,

placed no credence in them at all. What he finds quite certain is that Origen engendered Arius and all the other heretics that have appeared since his time. For, after having appeared to refute all the heresies, he ended by "falling" himself, in his commentary on the holy books, into a teeming throng of errors, absurdities, and perverse opinions, which he poured out on the universe. It is doubtless the case that, in some of the sermons that he addressed to the people, he engaged in a good discussion of morality and similar matters. But in matters of faith and the higher reaches of contemplation, he surpassed all heretics of the past and future in the heinous nature of his heresies. He became an example of the man who, puffed up by his knowledge, wanted to scale the heavens in order to investigate the mysteries hidden in them.[5]

To fulfill such a program, Origen would have needed three consecutive lives.[6] Some learned men, who sought to invest Epiphanius's account with at least a little bit of coherence, thought that the initial mention of Decius was a mistake, for under Decius, Origen had been in Palestine for quite some while. What is more, at that point he was advanced in age and was bound not to have survived the punishments that were being endured for the faith at the time. Thus they proposed that the text should be emended to read "Severus." But this meant hitting up against another impossibility, for the conditions under which Origen left Egypt for Palestine are well known, and there was no persecution in the Empire at that time. Those who had been used to reading Epiphanius and wanted to retain his account continued therefore to place the first episode under Decius, and, in order to render it acceptable, forgot that Epiphanius gave it a lengthy sequel. Some, moreover, neglected the Ethiopian. The portion of the account that entailed the sprinkling of incense was retained, and this late-blooming apostasy was explained as a divine punishment, coming to strike a man whom pride had fuddled. In this way, the whole framework of Eusebius's account could be kept. A last episode sufficed to complete it, and it was this episode that Eusebius, it was said, wanted to hide. Finally, there were certain writers, on the other hand, who retained only the last part of the account, or else, letting all the details be blurred, they became attached to the sole idea of a fall at the end of his career, a fall that could be interpreted as an apostasy, but also as a schism or as the founding of an heretical sect.

In the era of the Fathers, no serious author gave credit to Epiphanius's account. No one even mentioned it. This is as true of Origen's adversaries as of his defenders. If we turn to someone like Theophilus or even Jerome, we cannot believe that they remained silent out of daintiness. Either they

did not know it, or they found it too ridiculous. Nonetheless, the account thrived. It may be that an observation on the part of Rufinus appeared, eventually, to give it some credit. In his first Apology against Jerome, Rufinus had in fact written:

> I am not now discussing anything on Origen's behalf, nor am I writing apologetically in his favor. For he himself will discover whether he stands with God or has gone to ruin. He stands or falls by his own Lord.[7]

One can with higher probability draw a similar conclusion from a remark that can be read in the *Commonitorium* by Vincent of Lerins (434). Vincent, who was anxious to establish that no advantages of understanding or knowledge make up for a deficiency of tradition, noted the case of doctors who, "in the end, after they had possessed a sound faith for some time, either fell prey to a strange sect or themselves founded their own heretical group."[8] This was probably merely a general formula. But it is found at the beginning of a long chapter devoted wholly to Origen, and Vincent applied it, when, somewhat later on, after having engaged in a magnificent eulogy of Origen, of his extraordinary mastery, of his heavenly wisdom, of his holy life, and lastly of his confession of the Lord in the midst of tortures, he explained that:

> So long as this same Origen, who was so great and so renowned, abused the grace of God rather arrogantly, so long as he showed excessive indulgence to his own ingenuity and by and large put faith in himself, so long as he undervalued the ancient simplicity of the Christian religion, so long as he presumed that he was wiser than everyone else, so long as he despised the traditions of the Church and the teaching authority of the ancients and thus interpreted certain chapters of Scripture in a new way, he deserved to have it said of him before the Church of God: "If a prophet arises in your midst . . . , you will not, he said, listen to the words of that prophet."[9]

This amounted to speaking of Origen in nearly the same way as Origen himself had spoken of the heretics of his time.[10] Furthermore, this chapter on Origen was followed by a chapter on Tertullian, which was founded on the same kind of schematic arrangement and highlighted the contrast between his initial glory and his defection: "But the same reasoning applies to Tertullian as well."[11] The conclusion of this chapter,

moreover, made an explicit link between the African and the Alexandrian: "Drawing, therefore, on these numerous and egregious examples as well as other masses of ecclesiastical examples of this kind . . . we ought to understand, etc."[12] Was this not enough to affirm, or at least to insinuate a "fall" for Origen? Where had "Peregrinus" gotten this idea? It is astonishing that the editors, annotators, and commentators of the *Commonitorium* had not asked themselves the question. There are no precise details on this passage in the *Notes* by Baluze or in those of his successors.[13] This "fall" appears natural to everyone. The author of a thesis on Lerins and the fifth century does a good job of countering the great and excessive rigidity of the parallel established by Vincent, but he does this so that he can speak merely of "clouds cast over the orthodoxy of Tertullian" and uphold, on the other hand, "the fall of Origen."[14] Father J. Madoz is not surprised to see "the examples of Nestorius, Photinus, Origen, and Tertullian"[15] following close on one another, as if it were a matter of identical cases. Father de Ghellinck is content to observe that these chapters are "superlatively well-styled."[16] Nora K. Chadwick admires the two lovely portraits, in two parts, of Tertullian and Origen, which do such a good job of drawing a contrast between what the two of them were before and what they were after their defection.[17]

"Quite obviously," Vincent of Lerins "read nothing of" Origen's.[18] The few exact items of information which are contained in his sketch come to him from the *Ecclesiastical History* translated by Rufinus. From Rufinus, moreover, he derives the notion of a possible interpolation in Origen's books by heretics, an hypothesis which tempers or rather puts in question the way he develops the whole thing — and this is perhaps what he desired. Had he read the account by Epiphanius? Had the legend come to him in a form that was already vague and hackneyed, but so deeply rooted in people's minds that he believed that he had to take it into account? Did he urge a comparison that had been maliciously suggested by Jerome? If so, on what evidence? His text would be quite handily, even if incompletely, explained as a rhetorical amplification based on the following words that can be read in Rufinus's adversary:

> We praise the genius in Tertullian, but we condemn his heresy. In the case of Origen, we marvel at his knowledge of the Scriptures, but we do not accept the falseness of his teachings.[19]

Or else, prompted by his need for symmetry, did he, on his own authority, dramatize his exposition to make Origen's case analogous to that of Ter-

tullian — "for just as the former is easily to be judged the foremost man among the Greeks, so is the latter to be judged the foremost of all of us Latins"[20] — and thus give himself one more example to illustrate his thesis? Whatever the case may be, his text was destined to contribute to the propagation of the legend in the West.[21]

Beyond this, there was yet another kind of testimony, which seemed to some people to be even more convincing. This was an account that could be read in the *Spiritual Meadow*.

A monk, who had for some time been seduced by the Nestorian heresy, had a vision. A mysterious being appeared to him, in order to lead him "to a shadowy place that had a foul odor and was filled with fire." In the middle of the fire the being showed him "Nestorius and Theodore, Eutyches and Apollinaris, Evagrius and Didymus, Dioscorus and Severus, Arius and Origen, and several others."[22] Here was something that did not harmonize at all with the observation in the *Ecclesiastical History!* But even if the Holy Church had not wanted to condemn Eusebius for his excessive praise of Origen, she had, it was supposed, struck a cautionary note against him many a time.[23] He wrote a whole book to praise and excuse a schismatic, said the "Decree" attributed to Gelasius. And in recopying this decree, Pseudo-Isidore would be specific: "a reprehensible book."[24] Therefore, was it not easier to believe the evidence that did such a good job of justifying the harsh attitudes of councils by drawing on the notion of an unhappy ending to an illustrious career to explain them?

The legend does a marvelous job of taking into account the heavy weight of the anathemas. Thus it introduced logic into what otherwise appeared incoherent. Hence the great teacher had been at once the wisest and most knowledgeable of the doctors. He was truly a master of the Church, one of its mainstays. But for this reason he was that much more violently tempted:

> It is precisely to the extent that a person is gifted with more outstanding gifts that he is all the more prone to be buffeted by the fault of proud self-exaltation.[25]

In the twilight of a supremely glorious career, he fell. This "researcher into first principles," as he was called by Peter Chrysologus,[26] using a word that was an allusion to the parting shot of Saint Epiphanius, was finally overcome by mad intoxication. Stubbornly holding to his own understanding, he found himself outside the Church — "expelled from the Church," as Gennadius said in his summary of Theophilus.[27] His situation

was that of a fallen angel. Later, in fact, he would be expressly compared to Lucifer. This is what Bede already seems to say, although in a manner that is still implicit: like Solomon, the wisest of men, like Samson, the strongest of men, like David, the gentlest of men, who were seduced by women, he who had been the foremost master of the Church after the Apostles, so long as he remained in the paths of right and proper thinking, was one day seduced by the allurements of heresy.[28] This is also what Hildemar seems to say, in writing to Pacificus around the year 845 about the sin of Adam, when he uses a formula linked to that of Bede in order to speak of Origen in the following terms: "A man who was once so learned, whom Eusebius of Caesarea affirmed as having been the master of all the churches, so long as he was properly wise and sensible."[29] Does language like this not urge the supposition that in Hildemar's eyes, as in Bede's, after a long period of magnificent and sparkling orthodoxy, a fall had ensued? This fall remained shrouded in mystery. But thanks to this fall, if, when all is said and done, Jerome was not in agreement with himself, Eusebius, Jerome, and Theophilus, at least, were in agreement. Berengaud, who is more precise, declares that Origen, who was considered at first to be one of the mainstays of the Church, "left the Church, as did many others."[30] Perhaps Hugh of Saint Victor believed this as well, when he took up the epithet of "schismatic,"[31] which had come from Pseudo-Gelasius, in order to attach it to Origen's name — even though this epithet could be understood in a more benign sense, as Atto of Vercelli had tried to demonstrate, precisely in favor of Origen.[32] But in this case Hugh does not seem to be inclined to be indulgent at all, since, curiously enough, he reproves Eusebius not only for having praised Origen, but for having wished "to excuse him."[33] "He deviated toward heresy," would be the words used by Jean Beleth.[34] And Joachim of Flora, predisposed to a similar notion by his general theory of Greek Christianity, says: "After having given way to presumption, Origen went on to fall by the wayside."[35] Others, entering into the subject in even more detail, would indicate that he died impenitent. In this vein we have Philip of Harvengt, who contrasts his behavior with that of blessed Cyprian the martyr.[36] A Letter on the sacraments of the heretics, at the time of the Investiture Controversy, cited him as an example of those who, by following reason over and above authority, have shipwrecked their faith.[37] It is perhaps not an accident that this text reproduces the term "shipwreck," a term that Epiphanius used in a letter to Jerome, regarding Origen's disciples.[38] Finally, we understand now why some, such as Bruno of Segni, place Origen in the company of the grammarian Priscian, who, in consequence

of being confused with his pagan namesake, was considered to have apostatized.

Two texts are somewhat more explicit, although they do not supply additional details. The first is to be found in a chapter entitled "On the Lamps of the Church,"[39] part of an opusculum that was attributed to Bede, but is not earlier than the middle of the eighth century. It should be noted, however, that the work is presented as a collection of "Flowers" or "Extracts from the Fathers."[40] The author of the text in question is said to be in a situation of anxiety, like the chaste Susanna, for, in apportioning praise and blame as he has been requested to do, he lays himself open to the possibility of dissatisfying everyone.[41] Nevertheless, he will speak peaceably and "with all love"[42] of each of the stars in the firmament of the Church. One has the strong feeling that these precautionary notes pave the way in the main for the observation about Origen. It goes as follows:

> Origen Adamantius, who thought about greater and loftier matters, but did not make up the deficiency in his own talents, embraced one idea after another. And when he had thought about these matters with great ardor of mind, he loaded himself with greater burdens. And when he could not advance, this is how he fell headlong in great ruin, and the ruin of his doctrinal position was similar. And through its foolish seductions his teaching led many from the right path to another path, and its virulent poison was able to do injury with its ringing Siren voices, as it were, which do their harm with their many songs. Thus he was better than everybody else when it came to good things, but worse than everybody in bad things. For some of this man's teachings were beautiful and useful, while others fell by the wayside. Many of his worst disciples, however, seem to have proclaimed many poisonous ideas in his name.[43]

Apart from the last line, everything in this text revolves around the words which describe that "he fell headlong in great ruin."[44] The second text is of a similar inspiration. Manegold of Lautenbach, who was writing around the year 1083, uses it to describe this late and irretrievable fall in dramatic terms. Philosophy, he supposes, is not to be rejected entirely. But it is a terrible snare:

> Origen, the great man of the Church, who knew how to use divine eloquence in a marvelous way, had no fear about escaping from the ensnaring mousetrap of this philosophy by relying on the tremendous

> judgment of God. . . .[45] As long as his laudable genius kept its glowing warmth, under the tutelage of charity, he did not abandon the light of apostolic doctrine, as he walked a straight path and communicated to others in a healthy way the spiritual heights of his understanding. When, indeed, he tried to mix . . . the incomprehensible depths of the wisdom and knowledge of God . . . with the profane teachings of the Greeks[46] . . . this famous and high-thinking man suffered the wretched lot of human weakness and had a very grave fall, so that it was as if he had fallen from the highest of watchtowers. And he became an example to posterity of how necessary a reverential fear of divine purposes is when one deals with the heights and depths of God's mysteries. He showed how each person should have an inner awareness that the swifter the inspiration of his soul is, the closer he is to falling, unless he is influenced by the protective care of heaven.[47]

"As long as . . . When indeed":[48] it is always the same schematic outline, that of Vincent of Lerins. This is very much at odds with the reality, since the *Periarchôn*, from which exhibits were always taken, dates, to the contrary, from the first part of the life of Origen. But the system appeared to be indispensable. "He withdrew," "he abandoned," "he fell to his ruin," or "fall," "error," "ruin," "shipwreck":[49] we are always finding the same essential words followed in certain authors by an allusion to the notion of "condemnation."[50] Even admirers adopted them, in a spirit of sadness and dumbfounded sympathy. There have, however, been points of resistance. Historians, in particular, have not allowed any of this fable to penetrate their writings, the basis of which remains Eusebius. The remarkable thing is that Bede, the chronicler, is wholly unaware of it.[51] The same applies, in the ninth century, to the *Chronicle* of Ado of Vienne,[52] in the tenth century to Regino of Prüm (†915),[53] and in the eleventh century to his imitator Ekkehard, in both of his *Chronicles*.[54] We also have Hermann Contractus of Reichenau.[55] In the twelfth century there is Honorius, whose brief mentions of Origen are solely laudatory,[56] or Ralph de Diceto, who draws on Saint Jerome to cite only the eulogistic observation of the *Catalogus virorum illustrium*.[57] In general all of them strive to pay attention to the facts of his life which redound to his glory. Such, in particular, is the case of Fréculfe of Lisieux and Aimo of Auxerre.

Fréculfe uses glosses to improve on the traditional expressions in the accounts. For example, he writes: "In Alexandria, no, rather, in the whole

world, he is considered famous."[58] For him, Origen is the "foremost doctor." This "immortal genius" instructed his disciples in "divine philosophy," brought back heretics to the faith, and corrected those who deviated from orthodoxy. The greatest personages of his time came to consult him. Demetrius's conduct toward him was unworthy: "he raged against him in such a mad and unbalanced way. . . ."[59] Maximinus's persecution was directed mainly at him. Fréculfe is well aware, as is everyone, that he is reproached with having taught the salvation of the devil and a perpetual series of new beginnings in the *Periarchôn*. But he does not want to be one of his accusers: "About him there are some who say . . . ," he says simply, in a phrase thrown into the middle of his panegyric.[60]

Aimo occupies himself with the case of Origen in the sixth book of his "Summary of Sacred History" or "Memorial of Christian Things," which is essentially an abridgment of Eusebius. There, in order that he may respond to the great man's detractors, he broaches a lengthy parenthesis, one that is quite out of proportion with the remainder of this work, which is meant to be merely a small "manual": "I find it very strange that a man who was so illustrious, so openly combative and a fighter of heretics, should have fallen prey to a well-known heresy!"[61] The matter, he thinks, is that much more improbable, in that his life was quite penitent and chaste, insofar as his teaching was beautiful and pure. This is why our author implicitly attacks the notion of a final and particularly serious "fall."[62] In his Origenian fervor he reports only the first half of the judgment that has been handed down: "When he wrote well, no one wrote better."[63] He admits, however, that Origen was capable, here and there, of being deceived. But in this case, "truly a man with such a learned mind must be pitied, for he supplied us with such a wealth of erudition. As for his faults, if there are any in his writings, a certain luminous, heavenly splendor is capable of overcoming them in the things which he wrote from a spirit of faithfulness."[64] Then he explains the cause of these few errors and draws a lesson from them. It is the explanation and the lesson that we have already encountered in Manegold, only much gentler and without the fable of the fall:

> Origen strayed into error and portrayed things that are against the orthodox faith. I think that this happened to him because in his reading he was over-zealous in embracing the philosophers. For he had touched on and indeed comprehended the secrets of Plato, Pythagoras, and Zeno the Stoic, as well the books of Cerinthus and the other philosophers. And it may be that because he lingered too long

> over the golden cup of Babylon and drank overmuch from it, he was led to pour some of its dregs into Sacred Scripture.
>
> For this reason men of the Church should exercise great and vigilant caution lest they pay too much attention to philosophical principles. Otherwise they run the risk of becoming intoxicated by deep draughts of foolishness and being swollen with pride in their puffed up assertions. When this becomes the case, it is more difficult for them to backtrack and be recalled to the humility of Christ.[65]

Is this passage not at once both a resumption, in more muted tones, of the wise warnings issued by Vincent of Lerins, and a refutation of what he was insinuating about a fall on Origen's part? It is also something more, perhaps, as we shall presently see.

Otto of Freising (†1158), the best historian of the twelfth century,[66] no longer feels obliged to suppose that Eusebius, in his account of Origen, would have hidden the unworthy end of his hero. Furthermore, he is little inclined to trust Epiphanius or his ilk.[67] Like Aimo, he notes only that it is possible for some errors to have slipped into his quite numerous writings, filled as they are with so many useful things. These are errors that would arise from an excessive confidence in the powers of reason. Yet he does not base this judgment entirely on his own reckoning of the matter: "as some claim . . . ," he says.[68] He sticks to making mention of the "necessary and quite beautiful" work on martyrdom, which was written in the full flush of persecution, and goes on, finally, to relate the death of the great man at the age of seventy, without alluding to any defection whatsoever.[69]

Thus, among Latin writers, a twofold tradition, as it were, can be discerned with regard to Origen's "fall."[70] The historians are ignorant of it, or wish to be ignorant of it. Theologians and spiritual men, on the other hand, often allude to it, impressed as they are by a certain number of testimonies. The way in which they speak of it, however, is vague, and some of them remain perplexed. This is because the authors who transmit the legend to them are themselves quite imprecise and the testimonies are difficult to reconcile with each other.

On the one hand, everybody knows the account by Eusebius, which fills the sixth book of the *Ecclesiastical History* in its translation by Rufinus.[71] Naturally, this very laudatory passage says nothing about a story that had not yet been invented, and what it does say rules the story out in advance. Socrates, Sozomene, and Theodoret, who gave themselves the task, at nearly the same time, of continuing the *Ecclesiastical History,* also do not

make the slightest allusion to it. In their account of the first Origenist controversy, the first two of these figures turn out to be entirely favorable to Origen. Socrates, in particular, fulminates aginst the "free-coursing chariot of foul-mouthed abusers" and its retinue of "base and obscure" men who uttered calumnies against the great man.[72] Theodoret is no less warm in his feeling for the one whom he elsewhere calls "our Origen" and whom he exalts as "a man full of doctrine" and the vanquisher of numerous heresies.[73] In his *History*, however, very much caught up in a spirit of peace,[74] he hushes the controversy and does not mention the name of Origen. All three of them are full of respect for Eusebius.[75] Now these historians, who had themselves taken as a basis for their work the two books of Rufinus's *Historiae ecclesiasticae supplementum*,[76] which was probably read in a Greek translation, are known in the West thanks to Cassiodorus. The abbot of Vivarium had numerous passages from their work chosen by his friend Epiphanius Scholasticus, who compiled them into a connected and coherent account, probably in imitation of what Theodorus Lector had just done in Constantinople.[77] This was the *Historia ecclesiastica tripertita*,[78] whose rendering into Latin seems to have been the work of Cassiodorus himself. There, anyone can read the apologies for Origen by Pamphilus and Athanasius, the retraction of Methodius, who was destined to become an admirer after having been a detractor, the proud response of Theotimus, "a man who was quite renowned for the uprightness of his life," in opposition to Saint Epiphanius, who wanted to force him to condemn Origen, etc. Therein one can also read the judgment of Socrates, who supposed that Origen not only overcame the heresies of his time, but that he refuted in advance, better than anyone else, the anti-Christian sophistries of Porphyrus and Julian the Apostate.[79]

This *Historia ecclesiastica tripertita* was rapidly propagated. As early as the years 560-566, Liberatus of Carthage knew it and used it for his *Breviarium*.[80] At the time of Saint Gregory, a copy of it existed in the Lateran, and in 865 Nicholas I was still consulting it.[81] A criticism formulated by Saint Gregory, who reproached it with harboring an excessive indulgence toward Theodore of Mopsuestia,[82] put the brakes on its diffusion. Nevertheless, it was soon valued and sought again.[83] More and more it became an "authority."[84] However, another tune had taken its rise in the East, and some echo of it could be detected in the West. At the very time that Cassiodorus was accomplishing his work, the anti-Origenian party was triumphing at Constantinople. Under the influence of Justinian, the history of the Church was rewritten. Eusebius was discredited.[85] Epiphanius was esteemed, and his stories became authenticated facts. The

results of this recasting were finally registered in the works of a new trio: the Patriarch Nicephorus, George Syncellus, and Theophanes the Chronographer. According to Theophanes, for example, Origen was a "madman."[86] According to George (†810-11), he was an "impious person," a "deserter from the Christian militia." At the time of testing, after having first resisted the pains and torments, he shamefully succumbed, and death came upon him in his impenitence.[87] Now, in the ninth century, the work of these three historians — which was not without its merits in other respects — was compiled and translated in its turn. A new Cassiodorus, Anastasius Bibliothecarius, took this work on. This was the new History or *Tripartite Chronography*, which was to serve as a basis for the great History projected by his friend John the Deacon. In his preface, Anastasius deters the reader from resorting to the writings of Eusebius, as well as those of Theodoret, Socrates, and Sozomene, who are guilty, he says, of lies and tendentious omissions.[88] According to him, Origen the madman followed the tenets of the Gentiles as early as the year 185. Then this unhappy man undertook a commentary on the Scriptures. But, as he had fallen into "the slough of pagan fables," he was, in 215, "expelled from the choir of saints."[89] Eusebius, in particular, is to be reproved for the praises that he bestows on him in the time of persecution, since, in reality, when Origen was on the point of acquiring the palm of victory, he fell.[90]

In this way Anastasius adapted the best-known writings to the use of westerners. Even though he does not merit any confidence,[91] he himself was one of the most intelligent, most learned, and most powerful persons of his time. But his work fell through. The new *Tripertita*, which had been drafted around the year 870, was much less broadly diffused than that of Cassiodorus.[92] The manuscripts of it are rare. Although there were some copies in France,[93] Hugh of Fleury declared, about the year 1110, in the prologue to Book 6 of his *Ecclesiastical History*, that he had long sought it in vain.[94] Happy with his late discovery, he valued it highly. The authority of this work, he says, "is not trifling or foolish, but authentic, credible, and robust."[95] He goes on to say that it has disclosed to us many things that we were unaware of up to that point.[96] However, the example that he cites concerns Mohammed. Since his Book 6 only begins in the year 575, he uses Anastasius only for a quite recent period, in which neither Origen nor Origenism is any longer in question.[97] Thus Hugh of Fleury himself is no exception: on the subject of Origen Latin historians do not bear in mind Anastasius's *Chronography*. If some of them read it, they were not duped. Even at the height of the "dark ages," these men from "barbarian" countries appeared more reasonable under the circumstances than the

writers of the sparklingly brilliant Byzantine civilization. In the East, minds were won over by the notions of Saint Epiphanius. These notions gave rise to various amplifications, which is what we see in the great History of Nicephorus Callistus[98] or in the *Thesaurus* of Nicetas Choniates,[99] which are compilations of previous works. What we observe among the historians in the West during this time is silence. It may be, however, that there was a protest on the part of one of them. In the light of the *Tripartite Chronography*, there is a temptation, in fact, to ask oneself whether the lengthy parenthesis introduced by Aimo of Auxerre in his *Abridgment of Sacred History* might not be a consciously reticent reply to the fables that Anastasius was attempting to spread.[100] The hypothesis, however, is somewhat improbable. But, be that as it may, such a general reservation is remarkable. Owing without a doubt to the favorable prejudice that the Latin world accorded to Origen, it is just as effective in denoting a certain critical spirit, which the Greeks, moved by passion and then benumbed by habitual routine, lacked. This fact deserves to attract the attention of modern historians and could lead them to modify some of their judgments, which are sometimes too contemptuous on the one hand and too laudatory on the other.[101]

As for those Latins who showed themselves to be more credulous, influenced as they were by the authority of Vincent of Lerins and conciliar anathemas, if they did indeed accept the legend, it was most often in a wholly different spirit from that of the Greek historians. The latter did not speak of a repentance, or else they made it follow on a second fall. Some, such as Nicephorus and Nicetas,[102] faithful to Epiphanius's account, which they are content to amplify, place a definitive heresy, punished by excommunication, after a temporary apostasy.[103] Others, anxious to preserve some semblance of probability, feel compelled to reverse the order: it was no longer the case that Origen had undergone persecution in Egypt, but later in Palestine, and his apostasy *in extremis* became the just punishment for a heresy that was at once early in its flowering and tenacious. Such, we have just seen, was the version of Syncellus, which was followed by Bibliothecarius. As for the Latins, they speak only of a fall, which seems always to be a late-blooming affair, and which allows them to admire with a secure conscience the whole of a considerable body of work. Some of them go further and have the fall followed by an act of repentance. This is because they have an ancient testimony for their belief: the *Repentance of Origen*,[104] which would also be called the *Lament* or *Plaint*.[105] Gelasius's Decree had declared this writing to be apocryphal.[106] But it was quite tempting to believe in its authenticity, and this may be why there were

other titles given to it, as they were trying to convince themselves that they were dealing with another text. Indeed, how could the salvation of a man who was so repentant be doubted? For Origen had not merely melted in silent tears. At Caesarea he had delivered a whole speech, in order to bemoan his offense and ask forgiveness for it:

> O my friends, I am pained to the soul! because I have fallen from the heights. I have fallen, and I am broken apart, and there is no soundness in me. Let the angels grieve over me, because I have come to terrible ruin.[107]

How could this mediocre rhetoric[108] have been attributed to the author of so many homilies that were so well known? How could the translation of it have been attributed to Saint Jerome? Strange though it may be at first, this second attribution can be explained. The basis of it, at least, is apparent. In his lengthy personal apology to Pammachius and Oceanus, Jerome had recalled the letter addressed of old to Pope Fabian by Origen, in order to vindicate himself in the face of rumors spread against him after the premature publication of his teaching by his secretary Ambrose. In this letter, Jerome claims mistakenly, "Origen repents."[109] For this reason there is confusion. The admitted authenticity of the *Paenitentia* translated by Saint Jerome did not simply allow for a belief in the repentance and salvation of Origen. At the same time, it made some allowance for the belief, too, that Jerome had mended, by the evidence afforded to him by this translation, the excessive injuries and wrongs with which he had for some time burdened the person to whom he owed so much. But, even as they corrected one legend by drawing on another, the most ardent defenders of Origen found themselves confirming a legend which malice or stupidity had given rise to in the first place. Whether it be on the Greek side or the Latin side, the Middle Ages would not be alone, as we shall see later, in prolonging its existence.

4. Gradual Precautions

Whether or not it was justified by the legend that came from Epiphanius or from Vincent of Lerins, such in any case was the paradox that everyone, beginning in the time of Cassiodorus, was forced to confront: "The homilies of Origen are exceedingly eloquent. . . . The judgment of many of the Fathers has denominated him a heretic."[1] Given these conditions, it is quite

conceivable that our authors, whenever they cited Origen, took certain precautions — on an oratorical level, at least. When he attempted to recount how he prepared, with much pious care, a collection of all of Origen's homilies on the Octateuch, Cassiodorus was the first to take very strong precautions, even as he took refuge behind Saint Jerome:

> Saint Jerome credibly showed how [Origen] should be read. He did not want to keep the learned from their necessary reading of him, nor, on the other hand, did he want to bring the incautious to ruin. Certain ones have said not unjustly that he should be likened to the herb, dill. Inasmuch as he seasons the food of sacred letters, he should be read, so that in this way we may derive the most wholesome and flavorful juices from that source, but at the same time care should be taken not to swallow the poison of his faithlessness, which threatens our life. In his case, we can quite appropriately adapt what Virgil replied, while he was reading Ennius, when he was asked by someone what he was doing: I am looking for gold in a dungheap.[2]

The first image — this mix of quite wholesome juices and mortal poison — is curious. The second is somewhat strong! Formerly, to respond to those who reproached him with continuing to cite a man that he treated so severely in other respects, Jerome was content to advert to the counsel of the Apostle: "Test everything; hold fast what is good."[3] But let us reflect on the dates. Cassiodorus wrote in 543, on the very morrow of the brutal condemnation which Justinian obtained a few months beforehand in Constantinople and which Pope Vigilius had just ratified. He did not permit himself to be stopped in his enterprise by the diatribes of Epiphanius, Theophilus, and Jerome, which, however, he knew quite well and recalled. Nor did he let himself be stopped even by reprobations, which had not assumed a solemn character and which were already somewhat ancient. Only here we have the situation that with respect to Origen "it is well-established at the present time that he was condemned by Pope Vigilius, a most blessed man."[4] What anxiety there must have been in the workshop at Vivarium! Cassiodorus would not have wanted his work, to which he attached so much value, to be lost. It was no longer adequate for him to make the observation that, after all, Saint Jerome himself had no scruples about translating an author who was already being treated as a heretic.[5] He decided to forestall the attacks which he feared. Taking increased precautions, he took care to inform the reader that he put a sign in the margin of passages which there was cause to mistrust.[6] He does not,

however, want to exaggerate, and he protests against those who say "that in all matters Origen must be shunned and who accuse him of deceiving innocent minds with his subtleties. If he is read with the desired prudence, his poison cannot do harm."[7]

The words that Cassiodorus cites from Virgil had been set down by Donatus in his *Life* of the poet.[8] They had become proverbial. In the ninth century, in that potpourri which is his lengthy letter to Grimald, Ermenrich of Ellwangen (†874) recalls these words amid a confusing welter of references to persons, precisely in order to authorize the reading of Virgil, provided that one knows how to discard his lies. As if to promote the acceptance of his solution, which is a liberal one, when all is said and done, he does not mince words:

> . . . May the King of Heaven condemn such fictions. And what can I call these fictions other than the dropping dung of the calm, quiet horses who draw your wagon. Therefore it is not without cause that the poet Ennius, when asked by someone what he sought in Virgil, answered: "It is gold that I seek in a dungheap." And because, as you know, dung serves to prepare a field so that it might bring forth a more abundant crop, so the words of the pagan poets are helpful in many ways for achieving an understanding of divine eloquence, even though they are foul and disgusting, inasmuch as they are not true.[9]

This is a thesis that we already understand well. Others, too, would allude to Virgil's reply in an effort to justify "the books of the pagans."[10] In this regard, we have, for example, William of Hirschau,[11] Honorius,[12] and John of Salisbury.[13] Primasius of Hadrumetum referred to it in the prologue to his commentary on the Book of Revelation, in order to give himself an excuse for the use he was going to make of the Donatist Tyconius.[14] Aponius also recalled it, in order to authorize the Church's use of profane disciplines such as geometry, arithmetic, or dialectic, which had been cultivated by the Ancients, "in which, if something is found that is suitable for our religion, it is brought into the Lord's treasury, like gold that has been sifted out of the mud, like a very precious gem that has been lifted out of the dungheap."[15] Other writers apply this response to themselves. Writers in this category include Berengaud, whose modesty, we could say, is vigorous at the end of his explication of the Book of Revelation.[16] So, too, Wolfhard, in his *Life* of Saint Walpurgis.[17] Saint Gregory used terms that were scarcely less humble when he compared himself to

Saint Augustine.[18] Alcuin takes up the expression in all its power. This time he uses it, on the one hand, to justify Saint Paul for having sought out testimonies even in the writings of the pagans, and, on the other hand, to justify himself for daring to resort to two authors such as Origen and Cassian, "even though they seem, in certain parts of their writings, to deviate from the faith."[19] If one judges the situation by the number and length of borrowings of every kind that were made from the work of Origen not only by Alcuin, but even more so by so many others, never has so much gold been found in a dungheap.

Like Cassiodorus, Alcuin is happy to take refuge behind "the blessed doctor Jerome,"[20] whose literary practices, moreover, he is clearly aware of.[21] In his discretion he knows how to reestablish the inverted commas which "in the heat of dictation," as Dom Paul Antin says quite nicely, had been dissolved in the workshop at Bethlehem long ago.[22] Rabanus Maurus takes care to make the observation that he will only reproduce opinions from Origen that are consonant with a Catholic meaning[23] — which does not necessarily imply a mistrust on his part. Smaragdus, who compiled a collection of patristic texts, does not remove the texts of Origen and Pelagius from it, but simply asks that they should be read "with some precautions."[24] At the very point where Hildemar, writing to Pacificus in the neighborhood of the year 845, agrees to the eulogy that Eusebius had directed at Origen and cites him as a doctrinal authority of the first order, he adds the standard clause: "although he should be read with caution."[25] Aimo, who attempted, as we know, a standard apology, declared that he did not want to do it except "under the auspices of the sound faith of the Fathers," and promised to say only "what even orthodox and religious men could not deny."[26] Saint Bruno of Segni, who was no less desirous than the others not to deprive himself of the contributions of so great a man, informs us that "the knowledge of heretics and philosophers is often useful to us in many respects." And that is why he cites three illustrious possessors of this "necessary knowledge": "Aristotle, Priscian, and Origen."[27] Others free themselves of all their scruples thanks to a convenient system that reconciles their sentiments of admiration with the harshness of the official judgments. They suppose that what has been saved in the writings of Origen such as they have been transmitted to us is only that which is beyond reproach: "what was ill-said has been confuted, what was well-said has been saved."[28] His Latin translators, including Saint Jerome, have carefully expurgated him, so that there is nothing left in them which is not perfectly Catholic.[29] But a system like this was too contrary to the texts of Jerome himself to succeed in being imposed.

On two occasions Abelard returned at length to this burning subject, and each time he did so, he, too, invoked the authority of Saint Jerome. In his *Introduction to Theology* and in his *Christian Theology* he claims the right to cite the ancient philosophers, in spite of their pride and bad lives. Their testimony, he says, is to be found in the writings of the Fathers. Furthermore, if it were necessary to apportion blame to those who cite them, how much more so is this the case regarding those who have so sedulously transmitted the writings of Origen, which are full of such a great number of serious heresies? Nevertheless, Jerome and the others had no fear of transmitting Origen's writings. They did not want to let texts that could be useful perish, in spite of their "innumerable and exceedingly loathesome heresies."[30] One has a feeling here that perhaps Abelard's enthusiasm is not natural and that his tone of voice is forced, in order to satisfy the demands of *a fortiori* argumentation. He seems more moderate in the prologue to the *Sic et Non*, where he analyzes the behavior of the most important Fathers in dealing with Origen:

> Thus we do not doubt that blessed Hilary and some of the saints added many things from the writings of Origen and other erring figures to their own ways of thinking. They presented the opinion of others to us rather than proffering a judgment. This became known to us after the fact, however, not so much through their interpretation as through that of others. . . . When we find some ideas therein that are out of harmony with truth or the writings of other saints, they are to be attributed to Origen rather than Hilary, even though Hilary himself does not make this distinction. Of this kind is the assertion which tries to construe that the first psalm should not be understood to refer to the Head (Christ), but that it should be perceived as something said generally about any other just man. Even Jerome himself, following Origen in like manner, posited this in one of his expositions of some of the psalms. It should not be doubted that Origen himself, moreover, as he himself attests, published things that were riddled with huge errors in consequence of the opinions of others.[31]

What a very clever statement! To convey the idea of it more clearly, it may be paraphrased as follows: Attention! If you show yourselves to be too harsh to Origen, you risk condemning all the Fathers, for they all copied him, without warning us that they disclaimed association with him. And if you render them innocent by means of a distinction that they themselves did not make, why not, with all the more cause, render Origen

innocent, since he did not fail at times to make this very distinction regarding his predecessors?

Hugh of Saint Victor shows that he is prudent, as is his custom: "Origen, whose writings the Church neither refutes entirely nor accepts in every respect."[32] An anonymous writer, who sent a copy of the *De principiis* to a friend, was anxious to put him on his guard: "Receive what you asked for, but know that a great many of the things to be found therein should be the object of your loathing."[33] Another anonymous copyist of the twelfth century finishes his work by inviting the reader of Origen to gather the roses amid the thorns:

> Here there are many sacred songs, here there are many worldly songs;
> Of these, take and read the songs that please you.
> You see the meadows full of thorns and an abundance of flowers:
> If you do not want to pick thorns, pick roses.

These four verses were none other than the inscription composed long ago by Isidore of Seville for his library, where the profane books appeared alongside the Christian books.[34] The image was commonplace and had been in use for quite some time. It is already to be found with reference to the classical authors in Saint Gregory Nazianzen, who had himself accepted the ancients.[35] Saint Augustine had made use of a similar image.[36] Bede took it up, when he expounded the same theme, albeit for an application that was somewhat different:

> It is much more necessary to be careful when one plucks a rose, with its sharp thorns, than when one plucks a lily, with its soft leaves. It is much safer to seek wise counsel in the pages of the apostles than in Plato.[37]

It is more interesting to discover that our medievals also knew about the comparison through an observation attributed to Theophilus of Alexandria, Origen's great adversary. The little story had been reported by Socrates, and Cassiodorus had inserted it into his *Tripartite History.* In crushing Origen, said Socrates, Theophilus nourished himself constantly on his books:

> . . . When he was asked by someone how it came to be that he was once again embracing the things which he had rejected, he replied as follows: the books of Origen are like a meadow that is full

> of all kinds of flowers. Thus I pluck whatever is good and sound. If anything thorny comes my way, I cast it aside, on the assumption that it could prick me.[38]

It may be interesting, therefore, to pursue this simile of thorns. Another poet, who was perhaps more ingenious and certainly more indulgent, makes Origen himself speak. This is a way of acquitting him, even while acknowledging his singular weakness. Thus Origen is presented as the first of a line of great doctors:

> If you want to believe me, I have studied as many thousands of books
> As there are men in an army led into battle.
> My meanings have never been touched by blasphemy,
> But, prudent and watchful, I have been safe from the enemy.
> Only the words of the Periarchon have been my downfall.
> The weapons of the righteous have not put a stop to what has been conjectured against me from this source.[39]

One day Saint Bernard himself was compelled to explain himself. The day before, in choir, in the refectory or at some "collation,"[40] a passage had been read that had been taken from a homily on Leviticus by Origen, in which was to be found the following notable phrase: "Even to this day my Savior is still bewailing my sins, and his sadness remains for as long as we are in error."[41] It may be that the abbot himself had cited this in his preaching. Without a doubt, some monk from the ranks of those who did not pride themselves on their knowledge and superior wisdom would inform him of his astonishment and ask him for some explanations. Starting the next day, in order to satisfy this scruple, Bernard begins his sermon with a restatement of the question. Recalling the phrase from Origen, he concedes that, in fact, if it were taken too literally, "which is the kind of ring they have to them,"[42] it could make for a bad impression. Perhaps, he admits, the same could be said of other passages, too: copious and eloquent as Origen is, his language is somewhat lacking in circumspection. This reproach was not very serious. However, a murmuring, a "grumbling," could be heard in the audience.[43] At that point Bernard breaks off and asks what this means. He seems to be slightly nervous. If he wants to appease some of them, there are others who will be displeased. For, on this occasion, it seems quite clear that it is a learned monk, an admirer of Origen, who protests and scoffs. Therefore, addressing himself to this monk and those like him, Bernard says to them: you are instructed

in the law of God, explications of this kind are superfluous to you, you laugh at such cumbersome attention to detail for something that is self-evident. But as for me, I am the father of all, my duty is to the "least wise." I am quite willing, moreover, to concur with you that in this passage Origen is orthodox. He is speaking hyperbolically. In any case, it is his business, not ours. But Bernard breaks off once again. He is afraid now that he has conceded too much or that his concession will be used as a warrant to approve everything in the works of the Alexandrian thinker. He feels himself bound, in fact, by the solemn declaration of the council — "the authority of the Holy Fathers"[44] — which it is his duty to recall.[45] I cannot pass over it in silence, he says: the authority of the Holy Fathers warns us that Origen wrote certain things that are contrary to the faith, and that as a result he cannot be read without precautions. Then, after this new round of parenthetical remarks, by which his conscience is relieved, he returns to his preceding idea, namely, that it matters little what Origen thought precisely. What is really necessary is that each of us think rightly in the present day, that no one use his words as an occasion to move away from truth.[46]

Such is the movement of Bernard's thinking in this thirty-fourth sermon *De diversis*, insofar as it is possible to reconstruct it from a text that is not very explicit and, what is more, is probably reworked. To formulate his reservations in more precise detail — which he would not, it seems, have considered, if he had not been questioned by one of his monks and if there had not been a little demonstration afterward — he does not argue from an actual reading of Origen's text. He expresses his thoughts as if this single reading was not sufficient to warrant all the current harshness. He submits rather to an argument from authority. His very measured declaration, conjoined to a customary usage that had remained constant, shows that, if he did not want to let himself become involved in a personal debate, still he had no share in the prejudices that others had with regard to Origen. This declaration takes on a certain flavor when we observe that the words he uses to rule out discussion, "that is his own matter," are borrowed from the *Apologia* by Rufinus.[47] It is clear, moreover, that under the circumstances, even while he supplied the distinctions which were bound to render the exaggerations of his predecessor harmless in the eyes of everyone,[48] in his general view of the question, he, like many others in this period,[49] largely shared his views.[50] Even the *De principiis* was not too shocking, since he had it copied at Clairvaux for the use of the monks. It is also quite remarkable that in the library of the monastery the books of Origen were to be found classified immediately after those of Saint

Augustine, which directly follow "the books of the divine text."[51] This attitude, vouched for by the catalog of 1186, might even date from the time of Bernard. When, on another occasion, Bernard was to encounter an erroneous opinion attributed to Origen, he would prove himself to be a man of independence by opposing it forcefully.[52] But this great man of the spirit, whose doctrinal rigor and integrity left, to be sure, nothing to be desired, also knew how to discern the profound orientation of a whole way of thought. He felt a kinship with this other great man of the spirit. Presently, one of his disciples would say, quite in keeping with Bernard's spirit as with that of Origen: "The Lord Jesus Christ has not yet ascended into heaven."[53] It may be that Bernard was, in effect, the unitive connection which allows the *Homily on Leviticus* to inspire *The Mystery of Jesus*[54] five centuries later. "My Savior still suffers on account of my sins. As long as we remain in our error, He will be sad. Jesus will be in agony until the end of the world." Origen, Bernard, Blaise Pascal: an amazing connection, which is not all that unlikely.[55] In any case, in the "Origenian revival" of the twelfth century, it seems quite certain that, thanks to Saint Bernard, Cîteaux played "a preponderant role."[56]

Toward the end of the century, it seems that little by little a climate of suspicion had gained the upper hand. Within the monasteries, the homilies of Origen still continued to be copied for a long time. But already the program of Scriptural studies that had been sketched by the anonymous Victorine revived to some extent the image of roses being plucked from among the thorns, and proved to be extremely cautious. It is, however, inaccurate to say, like Trochon, that he counsels that Origen not be read:

> Sometimes with regard to the works of Origen and similar works, in which it happens at times that a serpent draws near the foot-path, like a spy, let him learn to search through them, seeking pearls on the bed, grapes on the vine, and roses amid the thorns, so that the following saying may be fulfilled: And if what they drink is deadly, it shall not harm them.[57]

As for the homilies which should be read at the Office, there are some now who would like them announced in the following terms: "The Homilies of Origen that were censured by Jerome."[58] And there are certain manuscripts which, in fact, make similar mentions, such as: "A homily of Origen . . . which has been corrected in a Catholic way."[59] Others would even like to keep the name of their author quite quiet, "on account of his

disgraceful heresy."[60] To warrant the study of Origen, Zachary of Besançon did a good job of explaining that the same principle is applicable to words of truth as to the holiness of a sacrament. Just as the holiness of a sacrament cannot be corrupted by sacrilege, words of truth cannot be tarnished when they have been proffered by a heretic. For this reason, he concluded: "wherefore it happens that the perversity of Origen's errors in no wise tarnished the study of him with respect to the parts where he shone."[61] But soon such vindications would no longer be as readily allowed. Without a doubt not everyone would go as far as to commit the excesses of the fanatical Gautier of Saint Victor, who accuses poor Rufinus of having joined "the party of the devil" by translating and publishing, together with some good things, "the blasphemies of Origen."[62] One sees, however, someone like Philip of Harvengt (†1187), whose judgment is ordinarily more moderate, becoming a rigorist here, as in the question of Solomon's fate.[63] Breaking even with the example of Saint Jerome, who had been invoked so often up to that point, he wants to reject works that risk leading the simple into error. For the more they were to rejoice in the truth that could be drawn from a source of this kind, the more harmful would their seduction be.[64] And the decision did not remain on the level of the theoretical. When one of his confreres assured him that he would derive great profit from one of these books, Philip undertook to show him that there was poison mixed in with the best of it, and he succeeded so well that he prompted him to renounce it: the Origenian convert "threw the book from his hands."[65]

A similar gesture had already been made by others, in the space of time between two dreams, not in the case of Origen, but Virgil. In that instance the gesture had only a symbolic importance and signified merely that there was no longer any desire to read the verses of the great charmer indiscriminately.[66] At this point, the gesture by which Origen is rejected is quite real. And there would be many who would imitate it. Knowledge of Origen declines rapidly. Some still maintain him in the company of the greatest doctors and acknowledge their debt to him. Peter Cambius (†1219) is one of these. In the versified preface to his *Opus Benoni* he says:

> There are four doctors of the Church, shining with glory,
> Isidore, Victorinus, and also Origen,
> Together with many others, whom it would be toilsome to enumerate,
> They strove to explain the figures which they found
> Hidden under a cloud in the old book.
> I have been eager to pluck flowers from their meadows. . . .[67]

Another of these was Gerald of Wales (1146?-1220?), who had recourse to the authority of him whom he calls "that great and sublime Adamantius, who is deservedly renowned."[68] Nevertheless, outside the cloisters, Origen was to be read less and less. He afforded fewer of the immediate resources that were needed for the new organization of knowledge. Saint Bonaventure and some others would still cite him, but the scholastics who had a true knowledge of him would become a rarer and rarer breed. Even in terms of his exegesis there would be a reliance on the calumnies of Theophilus, as transmitted by Jerome.[69] And even before the end of the thirteenth century an author as estimable as Ulrich of Strasbourg could, with unruffled ignorance, write:

> Just as the Jews, who understand everything only literally, are shown to be in error, precisely because many things cannot be understood literally, inasmuch as there are several prophecies expressly about Christ, even so Origen's error is condemned, because everything is to be understood spiritually and there is no truth in the letter of the Old Testament; since it is the case that the writings of the Old Testament describe things that happened and that are also confirmed in the Gospel, as is apparent in the genealogy of Christ and in similar matters.[70]

However, there was no end to the fighting about Origen's doctrine and his salvation. The observation proffered by Vincent of Lerins was much more lavish in its praise than its blame, which was, moreover, merely conditional. And without a doubt people recalled what Vincent had gone on to write, struck as he was by "so much understanding, doctrine, and virtue": who would not agree to say "that he preferred to be in error in the company of Origen rather than to perceive truth in the company of others"?[71] These words, which resemble those of Cicero,[72] and which Jerome had been the first to adopt,[73] would be cited yet again by the editor of Vincent of Beauvais, who would declare that they were repeated by a certain number "of the great, leading men of the Church."[74] But the affection which Origen's partisans often devoted to his very person made the controversy relative to his salvation all the more lively. Now, from roughly the middle of the twelfth century, there was better reasoning on this subject than that of the *Planctus* — better at least in its presuppositions, since it no longer compelled a belief in the "fall." The old monk's vision as reported in *The Spiritual Meadow* had, in fact, found its answer. Saint Elizabeth of Schönau (†1164) had received a revelation from the Blessed Virgin:[75] Origen, "that great doctor of the

Church," was undergoing only a light punishment, because he had not sinned out of malice, "but more as a result of the excessive fervor with which he immersed his understanding in the depths of Holy Scripture, which he loved, as well as in the divine secrets, which he was overly desirous of examining."[76] In the fourteenth century, Saint Mechtilde would obtain a similar revelation. It was declared to her from on high that God wished to hide from men what he forgave Samson, Solomon, and Origen, so that, terrified by this ignorance, the most learned, the wisest, and the strongest of them might learn to derive all their hope from God alone.[77] The result of this is a restoration in people's minds of the presupposition that there was a "fall" concurrently with the hope of forgiveness.

Thus there was sustained a controversy that was similar to those which arose with regard to the final lot of Trajan or, in particular, Solomon — whom Tertullian already condemned. In his treatise entitled *De vera pace* (1171), John, the abbot of Saint Mary in the Trastevere, appealed to this classical point of reference that concerns the salvation of the great king, in order, rather surprisingly, to introduce his subject, namely, the schism which the Church was undergoing at that time.[78] In it he cites a slightly earlier poem, in which, among the great doctors who have envisaged the problem, Origen is questioned in a precise way,[79] and it is not a matter of chance that, in treating Origen with so much consideration, he finally absolves Solomon: if he sinned, did he not repent, as witnessed by his Book of Proverbs?[80] Is not Solomon with his Proverbs the same as Origen with his *Planctus?* Also, the fact that Philip of Harvengt disagrees and condemns both of them equally, would not be attributed to chance.[81] On the other hand, one of the texts with regard to which erroneous doctrines and their authors were conjured up was the verse from the First Letter to the Corinthians in which Paul writes: "He himself will be saved,"[82] which bears naturally on taking an interest in the fate of the doctor who has more or less fallen into heresy.[83] Above all, many remained impressed by the anathema of the councils, although this anathema was not always registered without opposition. As well as being a reply to Johannes Moschus, the revelation of Elizabeth of Schönau seems indeed to be a protest against an improper interpretation of the council's phrase giving up Origen to "eternal condemnation." Controversy had arisen right from the beginning, at the very eve of the Council of 553. Was it permissible to submit the dead to an anathema? Many bishops said that it was not. The legate Eutychius, excellent court theologian that he was, had reassured their consciences at that point by citing the example of King Josiah, who, not satisfied with killing the priests of the demons, had removed those of

them who were already dead from their tomb.[84] This timely advice had led to the installation of the legate in the patriarchal see, thanks to Justinian. Not everybody, however, had been convinced, and Theodore of Mopsuestia's partisans, to evade the sentence that was passed on him, would say that he was the first author to be condemned when dead and not in his lifetime. For this reason we find the following words about Origen in the *Breviarium* of Liberatus of Carthage: "Origen was condemned when he was dead, and he had been condemned some time ago, while he was yet alive."[85] These terms were inaccurate.[86] Yet what was at stake, in an assertion like this, was only doctrinal condemnation. It is probable that Justinian wanted more, as is attested to by the scruples expressed in the *Constitutum* of Vigilius concerning Theodore:

> As regards his person, the pope took refuge behind the ecclesiastical custom of neither condemning nor rehabilitating the dead and of deferring, with regard to their final condition, to the judgments of the sovereign judge.[87]

In the twelfth century, the question remained hanging, as much in terms of his doctrine as of his person. This is what stands out in one of the cases of conscience drafted by Peter Comestor in 1192 or 1193[88] and recently edited by J. A. Dugauquier under the title *Summa de sacramentis et animae consiliis*. The Parisian master asks himself "whether a dead man can be excommunicated"[89]:

> It is astonishing that the Latin Church considers Origen an excommunicate, while the Greek Church celebrates his memory. And it seeks to know by what formal arrangement sentence is to be passed on the dead, or by what reasoning sentence is passed on Origen rather than on Augustine and Jerome, each of whom seems to have left something heretical in their writings. In the case of Augustine, it was when he spoke of souls having been created right from the beginning . . . and in the case of Jerome, it was when he lent his authoritative support to the proposition that: "Six thousand years of our time have not yet passed, etc." In the first place, there is some doubt about the formal arrangement. For it does not seem that we should say: we separate him from the household of Holy Mother Church etc.[90]

This is not all. Peter Cantor — or those whose argumentation he summarizes, for he does not offer a formal solution — multiplies objections.

In passing he raises a question that is quite analogous to the one destined to rock the Church in the seventeenth century with regard to Jansenius, in the controversy over "right and fact," as it was called:

> Also. How will he who cannot be summoned be thought to have no defence? How can he be condemned as defiant when he cannot impugn the authority of the person who is summoning him? Furthermore, it is certain that there can be no action by way of witnesses against someone who is absent. And how did the Church know and hold consistently, as it were, that it was Origen himself who wrote that which is heretical? To induce the Church's belief in this, surely it was not enough merely to have Origen's name inscribed on the title page? It may be that one of his rivals wrote it, or else, if he did write it himself, that he repented of it. It is quite certain that just as the Church was in communion with him when he was alive, so it ought to be in communion with him when he is dead too, unless there is an indubitable line of argument that would turn the scales against him. It is doubtful whether this is the case.[91]

The controversy ended up being prolonged quite beyond that point. It seems that at the beginning of the thirteenth century Robert of Courson wrote a treatise entitled *On the Salvation of Origen*,[92] which became a prototype for many others.[93] In the same century, the Dominican Vincent of Beauvais devoted several chapters of his *Speculum historiale* to Origen, to whom he was manifestly sympathetic. The author that he cited most readily in this work was Aimo.[94] He believed in the authenticity of Jerome's translation of the *Planctus*, as well as the authenticity of an *Apologia pro se*, some extracts from which he gave.[95] We shall see further on how the fall and salvation of Origen continued to fuel discussion right up to the last century.

5. The Beautiful Captive Woman

Today these discussions are quite outmoded. Nevertheless, what persists in the thinking of a number of moderns, with regard to Origen, is that placid ignorance exemplified by someone like Ulrich of Strasbourg. It is a surprise to be encountering it still in today's world on the part of worthy scholars who are accustomed to the methods of critical thought. Only in the case of Origen do they seem freed from all scruples, unless we suppose

that they are struck by some kind of paralysis or blindness, as soon as they have to take one of his works in hand or really begin reading it. A handful of judgments that come from an overly credulous Epiphanius, an overly violent Theophilus, and an overly clever Jerome[1] seem to be sufficient for them. Epiphanius, Theophilus, and Jerome, moreover, were themselves tributaries of a first bill of indictment mounted by the altogether unjust figure of Methodius of Olympus, a bill of indictment that was amplified, modified, and aggravated without any strong critical instincts being brought to bear on it. Justinian, the emperor pope, appears infallible to them, inasmuch as he was impartial. All kinds of examples could be cited![2] For them the best works of our historians of the Church and dogma are nonexistent. It was the men of the Middle Ages who were quite well aware that Origen had expressed erroneous opinions, and the vigorous strength of their faith did not permit them to minimize this flaw. They would have been the last men in the world to accommodate themselves to it. On the other hand, it was possible for them to fall prey, more so than for us, to false assertions that they did not have the means to control. At least, though, when it came to the principles of Origen's exegesis and the spiritual orientation of his thought, they had a general idea of that to which they should hold fast. And that is why their writings are rife with so many attempts to vindicate the customary approach that they never gave up trying to follow themselves.

It may be that the most ingenious of these attempts at vindication was borrowed from the words of Origen himself, and was an allegory to boot. In the course of a homily on Leviticus, the law regarding animals with a "cleft hoof" had led the speaker, who was following a usual procedure, to comment on another text, in which the question of pared nails arose. This was the law in Deuteronomy regarding "the beautiful captive woman":

> When you go forth to war against your enemies, and the Lord your God gives them into your hands, and you take them captive, and see among the captives a beautiful woman, and you have desire for her and would take her for yourself as wife, then you shall bring her home to your house, and she shall shave her head and pare her nails. And she shall put off her captive's garb, and shall remain in your house and bewail her father and mother a full month; after that you may go in to her, and be her husband, and she shall be your wife.[3]

This is what Origen has to say about the passage:

> . . . I too have often gone forth to war against my enemies, and I have found among my spoils a beautiful woman. For even among our enemies we find things that are good and proper. If, therefore, we read wise and knowledgeable words in one of them, we must purify them, we must remove and cut away everything in this knowledge that is deadly and vain. This is just like the hair and nails of this woman who was taken when the enemy was plundered. Thus we shall make her our wife, when she no longer has anything that has the appearance of infidelity, anything that smacks of death on her head or on her hands, so that she no longer bears anything impure or deathful either in her sentiments or in her actions. For the women of our enemies have no purity about them, seeing that there is no wisdom in them that is not mingled with some impurity. . . . As for ourselves, we who are engaged in a spiritual war and who, to destroy the power of the enemy, use not carnal arms, but the power of God, if we find a beautiful woman in the camp of our adversary, that is to say, some rational discipline, in that case we shall purify her, as has just been recounted.[4]

Thus the inventor here is not Saint Jerome, as seems to be the general opinion nowadays.[5] In a time when the learned did not disdain to read Origen, this kind of misunderstanding could not have taken place.[6] But Jerome, in fact, had not been slow in taking advantage of such a beautiful image. It recurs as many as three times in his correspondence. He uses it to establish his own apology against those who reproach him with a vestige of love for the world of secular letters. Did not Saint Paul himself, he notes, in writing to Magnus, cite pagan works? It is a fact that he had learned the proper way to treat these alien works from Deuteronomy.[7] Following his example, the Christian should, in the event of need, know how to turn a vile Moabite woman into an Israelite capable of giving him numerous legitimate children.[8] Jerome, one feels, appreciates the strong resonance of this image. All the same, he has a tendency to restrict its importance in two ways. He brings it up when he writes to Pope Damasus, in the wake of a diatribe directed against "the songs of the poets, the wisdom of the world, and rhetorical pomp," all these being things that he compares with the husks in the parable of the prodigal son, that is to say, food for swine.[9] This image must also have come to him from Origen. But he goes on, this time in a letter to Pammachius, to develop the lesson inherent in it, not as an ideal that can be realized, but rather as the lesser evil, as a series of precautions that should be taken, in a case where one

might have been seduced.[10] "Let us avoid wanting to take the captive woman as a wife!" he exclaims.[11] Finally, he hardly regards the biblical example as an invitation to some kind of effort at remodeling and assimilation in the realm of thought. He sees it rather as a variation on the theme of what he will later call "expurgated classics." What is seductive in the "beautiful" pagan woman is not so much "the wise and knowledgeable" words and "the rational disciplines" as "elegance of style" and "the sweet modulation of the verse."[12] The beautiful pagan makes him think more of Terence or Virgil than Plato.

This is the sort of emphasis that could be expected of Jerome, whose genius, more literary than philosophical, is so different from that of the Alexandrian. By temperament no less than by his primary formation, Jerome was a rhetorician, smitten by beauty of language. This must be recalled, if we are to make a fair judgment about some of the excesses that came from his pen. Origen, on the other hand, was primarily a seeker after truth who was careless about questions of form and style. Father de Ghellinck goes so far as to say that "as a writer, he is almost worthless."[13] This, however, is an extreme judgment. Here and there, without relying on style or vocabulary, merely on the strength of a combination of emotion and thought, he reaches the heights of the sublime. This is so in his preface to the *Contra Celsum*, where he alludes to the silence of Jesus before his accusers, or again in the second book of the *De principiis* (we no longer have the passage, except in translation), at the point where he introduces his reflections on the mystery of Christology. Pages like this should be classic. As well, he creates neologisms that open up endless vistas of meditation for the reader. Such is that heading entitled "Autobasileia,"[14] with which he was able to capture an extraordinary fullness of meaning, no less than an extraordinary intensity of feeling. It is this heading that recapitulates in itself the two aspects of Christ's religion that so many moderns have wanted to dissociate, even while it demonstrates that they are united in an indissoluble way. His spiritual imagination creates poetic treasures in an attitude of playful sport, as it were. More than once his homilies take flight with an amplitude of energy and movement that is at once rhythmic and progressive and impossible to do justice to as a translator. But these successes are essentially the product of a believer and thinker, not an artist or man of letters. As an orator or scholar, Origen is often diffuse, without lustre or liveliness. Thus, one suspects, Origen and Jerome did not have the same question to pose to the captive woman. It was not quite the same sort of uncleanness that they had to think about, when they trimmed the captive woman during the probationary period imposed by the law of the Lord.

As for Saint Augustine, he rediscovers the breadth of Origen's views on things. But in order to give expression to them in his *De doctrina christiana,* he is satisfied with another image, which is also biblical and also shaped by Origen, who made use of it in a letter to his disciple Gregory Thaumaturgus, after which it was been inserted into the *Philokalia.*[15] It is the image of the riches that had been carried away from the Egyptians by the Israelites at the time of their departure.[16] A less subtle, but stronger, image, in the sense that it did not signify simple permission on God's part, but a formal command: "not on their own authority, but by God's command" they had to wrest from the Platonists, those unjust possessors who were making improper use of them, the whole treasure-house of the "liberal disciplines," so as to put them at the service of the truth.[17] Augustine does not seem to be interested in the captive woman of Deuteronomy. That refined writer, Sidonius Apollinaris, was interested in her. In order to praise the doctrinal work achieved by his correspondent Faustus of Riez, he describes her capture by the future bishop when he was young, then the long treatment that he imposed on her, in order to make her his consort, in the solitude of Lerins and after that in the middle of cities, and finally the fruit that now results in their nuptials for the good of the Church:

> You have joined a beautiful woman to yourself, my lord bishop, although she has been married in accordance with the stipulations of Deuteronomy. While you were yet young, you caught sight of her amid the enemy troops, and loving her as you did in the battle-line of the opposing forces, you were not put off by the warriors who stood in your way, but you snatched her away with the powerful, conquering arm of desire. Philosophy was violently removed from the number of the sacrilegious arts. The hair of unnecessary religion was shorn, together with the eyebrows of secular knowledge. The wrinkled tatters of her old clothes have been trimmed, that is to say, the winding turns of sombre dialectic, hiding false and illicit morals. Now she has joined her cleansed members with yours in a mystic embrace. She has been your maidservant for a long time now, beginning in your first years. She has been the inseparable companion by your side, whether you were busy in the wrestling schools of the city or you were fretting in hidden solitariness. She has been your partner at the Athenaeum and at the monastery. In your company, she rejects worldly disciplines, while proclaiming heavenly ones. Once you are joined in marriage to the one who urged you on and gave you that

> impetus, you will have the impression that Plato's Academy is in the service of the Church and that you are philosophizing more nobly.[18]

As for Saint Gregory, he is probably too occupied with the shorn hair of Job, which he first explains at length in a literal sense, and then, harmonizing it with the shaven beard of the prophet Ezekiel, in an allegorical sense, in order to a reconcile it with his consideration of the analogous treatment prescribed by Deuteronomy.[19] But presently, in one of his *Questions* on this work, Saint Isidore of Seville inserts the passage from Origen.[20] He merely changes the order of certain phrases and artificially divides the explanation in two, as if it were a matter, according to some interpreters, of the "unfaithful soul," and according to others, of the "rational disciplines." Lastly, he adds two or three words, notably the characteristic word "superstitio," taken from a passage by Saint Augustine on the spoils of Egypt[21]:

> Firstly, all the uncleanness of *superstition* should be removed and cut off from her, and so she should be adopted for the study of truth. Inasmuch as the disciplines of the pagans are unclean, because there is no wisdom in those who do not have faith. Wisdom is of such a nature that there is no uncleanness or *superstition* mixed in with it.[22]

This judgment can appear severe. In fact, it is that of Origen himself.[23] And if it is severe, it is not restrictive like the judgment of Jerome. It is found two times, properly speaking, in Saint Bede, who reproduces Origen's development of the idea roughly just as Isidore had reworked it, giving it a certain precision of detail.[24]

Henceforth the two images will be current. They will often be associated.[25] Only the first need concern us here.

Completing Augustine by way of Origen, Rabanus Maurus comments on the text of Deuteronomy in his great didactic treatise, the *Clericalis institutio*, where he treats the "pagan captive woman"[26] with sympathy. There is no problem understanding her in a welcoming and friendly way:

> The figure of the captive woman must be understood as meaning that . . . *This is what we are accustomed to do*, when we read the pagan poets, when books of secular wisdom come into our hands.[27]

The only thing he does recommend, following Saint Jerome, is that we should act with prudence, so as to avoid scandalizing the weak.[28] To the

contrary, just as Prudentius of Troyes explains to John Scotus that we must not claim the Egyptian spoils without many precautions, only in the event of necessity and while keeping watch over the dangers that always lie in wait for an operation that is so delicate,[29] Paul Alvarus of Cordoba brings to the notice of his correspondent, John of Spain, that the beautiful captive woman is a formidable piece of plunder and that one ought to be suspicious of embracing her prematurely.[30] Also, cultured and literate man that he is, he refers to Saint Jerome, whom he admires fervently, and, like Jerome again, he is keen to draw on an example from Saint Paul.[31] In the following century, Saint Maieul of Cluny is said to know how to tame such a desirable prey. He approaches her prudently, but without any fear. This is what his biographer affirms, in a passage that is itself full of moderation:

> When he read the philosophers and the books of secular wisdom, he was keen and industrious in obeying what the Lord commands from the legislator in the law regarding the captive woman. When her head had been made bare and she had had her nails clipped and her hair shorn, and had been cleansed of all her filth, she came to embrace the one by whom she had been captured. Drawing on this simile, he found it worthwhile to remember what was found useful in the books of the philosophers. He stripped all that was superfluous from his love and care for secular things as if he were dealing with something poisonous and death-dealing. He sheared them to the point of baldness and cropped them down with the sharpest of scissors, as if he were paring their fingernails.[32]

Rathier of Verona knows, likewise, that there is no law that forbids us to be united with the foreign woman. But being more fearful, perhaps, than Maieul, he notes with trembling that, if all the conditions prescribed are not carefully respected, Christians might have to undergo the lot of those Israelites who united themselves to the daughters of Moab and adopted their Baal.[33] The anonymous chronicler of Saint Benignus of Dijon recounts the life of Halinard of Sombernon, who was abbot of his monastery before becoming bishop of Lyon (†1052). This chronicler tells us that, in his reading of the philosophers and other pagans, Halinard showed great wisdom in observing the prescriptions regarding the captive woman: he appropriated to his own good anything that he found to be useful in these books. All that was superfluous, all that smacked of the world, "he stripped away, as if it were poisonous and death-dealing."[34] This did not

stop him from being in the very front ranks "in his study of legal decrees and philosophical arguments."[35] Saint Peter Damian, ascetic though he was, seems fascinated by the beautiful captive woman — but in the way that a person might be fascinated by the devil. Without being brought to that point by the biblical text, he alludes several times to the old Origenian theme, and each time it is in order to bend it into a fiercely restrictive shape — as if a Christian writer owed it to himself to formulate his reservations all the more vociferously, precisely because he himself more openly follows the same trade. Once he uses it like Jerome, against monks who let themselves be tempted by literary studies or who remember, without an adequately critical sense, what they once learned and tasted when they were in the world.[36] Another time he indulges in a eulogy of Saint Eleuchadius, who was bishop of Ravenna, and who, before being converted to "the discipline of the Church," had been "a doctor of worldly learning." Peter praises him for having descended from his profane chair in order to come to submit himself humbly to Christ:

> Whatever he had earlier discovered to be superfluous in those matters, he trimmed in the more noble studies of this school. Whatever he taught there of a lying or superstitious nature, he corrected in the discipline of ecclesiastical purity. For this reason, it is proposed by Mosaic law that bodily superfluities should be shorn away from the woman captured in war and chosen for marriage by the victor, etc.[37]

Yet another time, after having protested against the curiosity of dialecticians and rhetoricians who disturb the discipline of the Church and who, by dint of their syllogisms, seem to submit divine omnipotence to the laws of necessity,[38] he posits conditions under which use of the branches of human knowledge in the explication of Scripture could be tolerated. The biblical image remains implicit here. It is no longer a question of booty captured in war. Rather, Peter insists on the condition of "slavery" in which human knowledge ought to be maintained, once it is introduced in the service of sacred science.[39]

Saint Bruno of Segni, who knows this interpretation, does not adopt it. For him the captive woman is not the "teaching of the philosophers," but the human soul. Here one recognizes an echo of the division into two parts as declared in the works of Isidore.[40] A short while later, however, Baudry of Bourgueil (1047-1130), a witty prelate, a prolific writer, an uncritical historian, an amiable and sometimes light poet, and a good priest

to boot, knits together the theme of the captive woman, along with the theme of spoils, on its traditional ground. He deals with it more as a literary man than as a theologian. With him the image becomes generic and loses its vigorous force, while the thought, in order to achieve expression in verse, is no less banal, even though it be fertile:

> Thus I transport the captive trifles of the pagans,
> I, the victor, rejoice in the captive spoils. . . .
> Let the plunderer be enriched by the enemy's Latin tongue.
> Let the Greek and the Hebrew serve in submission.
> Let us know and read everything.
> Let us read every book that is.[41]

Peter the Venerable desires to praise Heloise for having acquired a high degree of culture with the intention of consecrating it to the Lord. One can well imagine that, to express his commendation of her, he made an intentional choice of the image of the treasures of Egypt.[42] He could hardly have used the other metaphor in addressing himself to a woman! Hugh Metel, on the other hand, speaking of himself, congratulates himself on the union that he has contracted on his return from "Babylon," with the captive woman of Scripture, after having accomplished everything that needed to be done.[43] For the insertion of the captive woman in the *Glossa ordinaria*, it is the text of Isidore that has been retained, with the example, taken from Jerome, of Saint Paul citing the pagan authors.[44] Werner of Saint Blaise, akin to the Gloss in identifying an impersonal "deflowerer," comments on the image in his turn, eclectically and without any depth, holding to the middle ground between the two tendencies that continue to be opposed.[45] In his *Liber exceptionum*, Richard of Saint Victor is no less content to reproduce Isidore and the Gloss.[46]

This is not the case with Garnier of Rochefort. He accentuates the image. In the course of a sermon (who would have imagined it?) for the Feast of the Holy Trinity, he develops it at length, in his somewhat complicated, already decadent manner. But his approach is faithful to a glorious Cistercian enthusiasm that has not yet subsided. He does it nobly, charging his image with a load of thought. He, too, uses it on an equal footing with the image of the spoils of the Egyptians, as well as the images of the well and the concubines of the patriarchs. All of these images are modeled on Origen.[47] He justifies a union with the captive woman, which is to say, the use of profane doctrines — "one falls in love with the beautiful woman amid a number of captives, when some useful teaching that seems

good is found amid foreign writings"[48] — by showing not only what should be stripped from them, as was suggested almost exclusively by the terms of the biblical account, but also what they themselves receive when they enter into the Christian synthesis. What is more, he uses the same passage to take up an idea that was already found in Rabanus Maurus[49] and Rupert,[50] where it was expressed by the word "conversion." To this idea he adds the classic example of the water changed into wine by the Lord,[51] thereby showing how human speculation, in order to come to something, needs to be assumed by divine doctrine. Divine doctrine, for its part, has no need of speculative thought, even though we ourselves need it in order to assimilate divine doctrine. Lastly, he highlights the dialectical character of the relationship that is established between one and the other. Assimilation, he explains, does not presuppose merely a certain number of preliminary precautions. It is not the consequence of a simple discernment that is effected with prudence. But, as is indicated by the text from Deuteronomy and as Origen spoke of it, it can only be the result of a battle:

> For the Church's doctors marched out to do battle with their enemies, when, armed with the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God, they went forth to overthrow the dogmas of worldly wisdom.[52]

With this last precise detail, Garnier reunites the spirit of two series of texts that the past offered to him, the welcoming ones and the harsh ones, the optimistic ones and the fearful ones. But the mutual opposition of these texts was sometimes only apparent: he shows in a striking fashion how the Christian can be all the more bold in his use of ideas that have come from the outside, precisely because he has fought them more vigorously from the outset, when they were in their first impure form, using that "sword of the spirit" which is not a weapon of death, but an instrument of penetrating discernment. This piece of affected eloquence will thus prolong the letter of Origen in a spirit that is perfectly that of Origen. If it is difficult for it to serve as a defense for Garnier against those who reproach him with being lost "in a long and tedious maze of allegories," at least it suffices to prove that his words were not entirely "incoherent" and "sophistic," that his "folly" was not always "limitless," and that all of his sermons are not proof, to the same degree, of "the extreme degradation of oratory as a genre at the end of the twelfth century."[53]

The thirteenth century would not forget the notion of the beautiful captive woman. Joined to the idea of the spoils of Egypt, it can be found in the work of a popularizer like Jacques de Vitry (†1240).[54] It would even be found embellishing pontifical prose in serious circumstances. In 1228, in a vehement letter which recalls Saint Peter Damian more than it does Garnier of Rochefort, Gregory IX alludes to the image — in conjunction, again, with the spoils taken from the Egyptians. The pope addresses the masters of theology in Paris. Having only just finished imposing studies on the Franciscan order, he warns them nonetheless against "worldly knowledge" and calls upon them not to "adulterate the Word of God with the fictions of the philosophers."[55] As man should rule over woman and as spirit should rule over flesh, the theologian should hold sway over every human discipline, a theme that we are well aware of and that comes to strain or falsify the last feature of the image somewhat. She who should have been raised at the end to the rank of spouse is now kept with a firm hand in the condition of a servant girl, almost a slave:

> . . . The girl who was captured from the enemy, who has had her hair shorn and her fingernails clipped and who is joined to a man of Israel, should not be dominated by him, but should rather submit to him as a subject.[56]

Still later, Saint Thomas Aquinas, who belonged to the family of those who followed Origen and Augustine, and all of whose work hearkened in its own way to the wishes of someone like Rabanus and Garnier, uses the same two images as Gregory IX. A man of study, not of governing rule, he does it with a different intention. To be sure, it is not a contradictory intention, but one that is very much complementary. Since he welcomes the spoils from Egypt,[57] Saint Thomas thus adopts the beautiful captive woman.[58] In endorsing this act of adoption he follows Saint Paul "in a spirit of obedience to the faith,"[59] and he invests the act with a quite serious significance. In fact, he explains, "the one who is learned in Holy Scripture welcomes the testimony of truth, wherever it comes from." He knows that all truth is by rights Christian, that for this reason there is nothing to fear, but that truth must be taken by force, as Saint Augustine said, from "those who possess it unjustly."[60] In this respect, as happens to him so often, Saint Thomas is the simple and faithful echo, right down to the smallest detail, of a long tradition. His means can often be different and also more potent than those that many before him had at their disposal. From them to him, though, the spirit of the thing has not changed.

In his commentary on the Song of Songs, William of Saint Thierry had provided for the captive woman of Deuteronomy by an unusual adaptation. For him it was no longer a matter of illustrating the use that a Christian made of profane disciplines or pagan letters, but the relationship that should be established between the human soul and her God. It was the soul herself who was that foreign woman that Christ had vanquished in his victorious war against the devil and that he was preparing to take as a spouse. She addressed herself to him, she met his requirements, she asked him to rouse up love in her and to make it grow by his speaking to her:

> Let love, if it does not yet exist, come into existence by your talk. If it exists, let it grow and become strong, until your captive maid, vanquished by right of war and the spoils of victory, finds grace in your eyes through the proper fruits of penance. When everything that is superfluous about her has been shorn off by you in accordance with the law, let her enjoy, in perpetual charity and indissoluble union, the embrace of the one who has vanquished her![61]

But the man who knew best of all how to derive the most remarkable, no less than most paradoxical, advantage from the old Origenian image, without detaching it from its traditional patterns of significance, is Rupert of Deutz. The advantage he derives is also of the most subtle and the most malicious kind, and it is worthwhile reading his work.

Rupert, as we have said, often took his inspiration from Origen.[62] Like all the others, and even more than the others, because he drew suspicion to himself, he feels the need to explain himself. He succeeded in doing so discreetly no less than amply, precisely on account of this text from Deuteronomy from which Origen had taken his image. To all appearances, what he writes is merely the reworking of a commonplace. But Rupert's treatise is developed with consummate art. Indeed, he is not satisfied with defending in a quite Origenian sense the conduct of one whom he calls, in Origenian terms again, "a man of the Church." But he makes arrangements to make his own conduct warranted by the most eminent reader of Origen, Saint John Chrysostom, no less than by his greatest enemy, Theophilus of Alexandria, who was also, as we have seen, his diligent reader. He does this without uttering a single harsh word on his own and without even seeming to deal with the question. Origenism is not in question. The reading of Origen's works is only mentioned by way of general example, introduced in the course of an

allegorical exegesis, the theme and manner of which are borrowed subtly from the great Alexandrian. Probably no passage would be more appropriate to illustrate what Edgar de Bruyne claims when he says that "medieval man did not rejoice in themes so much as quite nuanced and subtle variations in which old commonplaces were portrayed."[63] The passage in its entirety is a free-running pastiche of Origen, directed to Origen's adversaries, on behalf of Origen's teachings, with a view to authorizing the use of Origen:

> In terms of the literal truth, the Hebrews recount that David did the following in dealing with Maacah, the daughter of Talmai, king of Geshur (2 Sam. 3): namely, after she was captured in battle, he had her hair and nails cut and took her as a wife according to this law. From her were born Tamar and Absalom.
>
> Next, as far as the mystical sense is concerned, the man of the Church should do things in this way. The beautiful woman in the ranks of the captives or of the enemy is Sacred Scripture as found in the treatises of heretics. For many heretics or heresiarchs have sat in the chair of Moses or even on the apostolic heights, and although they have proposed bad and untrue suppositions about divinity, they have nonetheless said many useful and perceptive things about morality and allegory.
>
> If then "you go forth," he said, "to fight against your enemy," that is, if you have a holy zeal against the heretical enemies of the Christian faith, "and the Lord your God gives them over into your hands," for you to obtain the palm of truth with a mighty faith and sound doctrine, the legal necessity is imposed on you not to fall in love with any beautiful woman that you should find among them. Which is to say that you should not read or hear any useful exposition of the Scriptures that has been written by them. But, once everything has been tested, you must hold fast what is good and abstain from every form of evil (1 Thess. 5). For this is what is now being said: "She will shear her hair, and will cut her nails, and put off her garb, etc." For shearing the hair, cutting the nails, and changing the garb of the beautiful woman is to cut off everything that is distorted and everything that is superfluous to the sacred reading and finally carefully and conscientiously to remove every form of evil, which is to say, all heretical meanings, so that you may have a suitable spouse in accordance with the saying in Proverbs that goes: "Say to wisdom, 'You are my sister,' and call insight your intimate friend." (Prov. 7:4)

"Then, if you have no delight in her, you shall let her go where she will; but you shall not sell her for money, you shall not treat her as a slave, since you have humiliated her." In terms of the literal meaning, there is a manifest fairness. Anagogically the changeableness of the judgment of readers is restrained, namely, the kind of judgment that a proposition of the Church reproves in Theophilus, the bishop of the city of Alexandria. Because Theophilus was the enemy of John of Constantinople, who is called Chrysostom, he condemned the reading of Origen, to whom he was well-disposed, from his jealousy of John. And finally, when John had been condemned, because he did not refrain from reading Origen, he himself embraced the reading of Origen again. When someone asked Theophilus how it was that he could embrace again what he had rejected, he replied as follows: "Origen's books are like a meadow full of flowers. Whatever good I find in them, I pluck. If any of them strikes me as being thorny, I drop it, in case it might prick me."

Therefore he says, "Then, if you have no delight in her, you shall let her go where she will." Which is to say that if, after your trial of it, you condemn any captive reading, once it has been trimmed and abridged, you will not take it back to your school again, when your opinion has changed. Because you have humiliated it, that is to say, condemned it, you would seem to have condemned it not so much for rational reasons as out of envy.[64]

This last stroke, a true "Parthian shot," still strikes me very much as being directed at Theophilus and those like him. This is the Theophilus whose twofold inconsistency Rupert has just underlined and about whom the *Tripartite History* said, according to Socrates, precisely in order to introduce the little story that is reported here, that in this affair he was animated by a growing "invidia."[65] It refers to Jerome as well, who, at the time when he was a sincere admirer, had declared that Origen's detractors had been moved by "invidia." Lastly we have their heirs, those "invidi" with a poisonous grudge[66] whom Rupert himself has to suffer even today.[67] "Envy, which arises from the poisonous bile of the devil!"[68] When it is added to the preceding strokes, a stroke like this makes the whole passage a kind of masterpiece. Rupert of Deutz, who did not fail to plumb the depths or scale the lofty heights, also did not fall short in his sense of what was appropriate, not to mention his sense of humor.

CHAPTER FIVE

The Unity of the Two Testaments

1. Evolution and Mutation

Of Origen's two formulas, the one that puts tropology immediately after history was tripartite right from the beginning, since it was founded on a putative analogy between Scripture and man, insofar as he was made up of three elements. On the other hand, the formula in which allegory precedes tropology would only be quadripartite through some kind of development or by its being broken up and divided. In its initial simplicity, which contains all that is essential about it, it includes only two members, and these two members are understood and mutually arranged in such a way that nothing analogous can be found, even notionally, outside the Christian faith. What we have here is a theory that, even in its very form, owes everything to this Christian faith, and that, in its content, seeks to give it full expression. It is because he has neglected to make this fundamental declaration that more than one historian has spent vast storehouses of learning in vain, or rather he has ended up falsifying, indeed, conjuring away one of the greatest facts of history.

To summarize the whole thing briefly: the Christian tradition understands that Scripture has two meanings. The most general name for these two meanings is the literal meaning and the spiritual ("pneumatic") meaning, and these two meanings have the same kind of relationship to each other as do the Old and New Testaments to each other. More exactly, and in all strictness, they constitute, they *are* the Old and New Testaments.

In the Book of Revelation, Saint John, like Ezekiel, speaks of a scroll, written within and on the back.[1] "Intus et foris" is how the Vulgate

translates it. This is a good translation, since we are dealing with a scroll, the scroll that we see at times in medieval paintings and sculptures. It is held in the talons of an eagle, whereas the three other symbolic animals hold a codex that is similar to our present-day books. Most often, as we have seen above, tradition regards it as the book of the Scriptures. Outside it is written in accordance with the letter. On the inside it is written in accordance with the spirit.[2] To understand it, we must pass from one to the other. A spiritual understanding of the Word of God as recorded in the Bible must be acquired. This understanding, which penetrates through the surface of the letter, or which bursts forth from the letter, is commended or distributed in a "spiritual commentary"[3] by all those who have a teaching role in the Church. For those who teach have received "the dispensation of the Spirit" from God, as Saint Paul says.[4] It is "a higher degree of understanding,"[5] a "higher" or "deeper"[6] understanding, "more absolute" than a literal understanding.[7] From it there follows a "more noble,"[8] a "more august"[9] meaning. It is an "interior" understanding, which discerns "internal causes,"[10] whereas the literal sense remains external and superficial.[11] It is a "sublime"[12] and "sacred"[13] understanding, "a more sacred kind of understanding,"[14] which one receives in order to become perfect.[15] This understanding is approached by degrees or stages,[16] by the action of a grace coming from on high.[17] It bequeathes a "sublime" and "divine" meaning to us, lifting us into regions where the mystery of the heavens is opened to us.[18] In it we find the restful state of interior light,[19] in it alone we stand in awe of all beauty,[20] and we taste all the piquant flavor of revelation.[21] It engenders a spiritual joy in each one of us and in the whole Church.[22]

Far from being an invention, the result of a whim or a dream, this understanding has its own structure, which compels us to recognize it. The spirit is not separated from the letter. At first, it is contained and hidden in the letter.[23] The letter is good and necessary, because it leads to the spirit. The letter is its instrument and servant.[24] If, in ancient Israel, the chief priest wore two tunics, it was to signal to generations yet unborn this twofold meaning of the Divine Law, consisting of the literal and the spiritual.[25] The spiritual understanding comes to remove the veil that covers the letter or the veil that is the letter, in order to extricate the spirit from it.[26] Or else, in opposite terms, it comes to cover up the poverty of the letter with a royal mantle that transfigures it.[27] Without it, moreover, one sees Scripture without really seeing it.[28] Like the sun breaking through a thick cloud,[29] it lays bare the spirit, like the core beneath the crust,[30] like the grain beneath the straw.[31] It sheds light on all of Scripture, for every-

thing in Scripture should be understood spiritually.[32] Everything in Scripture is "spiritual," everything in it is "intelligible"[33] — but on the condition that one work hard to hear it by an interpretation, a contemplation, and an anagogy that are spiritual.[34] All that Scripture recounts has indeed happened in history, but the account that is given does not contain the whole purpose of Scripture in itself. This purpose still needs to be accomplished and is actually accomplished in us each day, by the mystery of this spiritual understanding.[35] Only then — although it is a direction that is indicated rather than a landmark that is ever attained — will Scripture bear us its fruit in its fullness. Only then will we have the "truth" of it.

If we take all these traditional expressions, but forget the context that determines their importance, we are not, up to that point, really saying anything that cannot more or less be found at the heart of various "religions of the Book," at least as regards what is believed by their followers. In all Scripture that is considered to be revealed, the tradition that refers to Scripture presupposes some hidden meaning, and it is precisely this hidden meaning that is the point of departure for many curious constructs and subtleties of thought. But here we have something that obviates all comparison, imparting a unique significance to the "spiritual understanding" of the Christian tradition.

For the Christian there exist two successive "Testaments," which are not primarily or even essentially two books,[36] but two "Economies," two "Dispensations," two "Covenants," which have given birth to two peoples, to two orders, established by God one after the other in order to regulate man's relationship with him. The goal of the one that is prior in time is to prepare the way for the second. But this is not what merits them those respective terms of "old" and "new." The New Testament does not take its name solely from the fact that it comes second in time. It is not merely "modern."[37] It is the last word, in an absolute sense: "the latest thing,"[38] "a thing that is new and eternal."[39] It is definitive, eternal: "it is said to be eternal, since it will not be exchanged for another testament in the same way as the old was exchanged for the new";[40] always new, "because it has never grown old";[41] renewing everything: "it is said to be new, because it speaks of things that are immutable and ever new";[42] "always new, because it is always renewing minds, and never old, because it never withers."[43] It is that "Power of God," "which cannot pass away or grow old."[44] "Whereas the Old Testament never discerns the present except by reference to the future, the New Testament discerns a real present that nothing can call into question. The New Covenant is not repeated. It is completed and fulfilled once and for all."[45] Not only will it not be

revoked or perfected, but the way in which it is understood will not change: "the understanding of it never changes."[46]

Thus there is, in one sense, an opposition between the two Testaments: "one way then . . . another way now."[47] But there is nonetheless a unity. Their relationship is ambiguous. The second arises from the first and does not repudiate it.[48] The second does not destroy the first. In fulfilling it, it gives it new life and renews it. It transfigures it. It subsumes it into itself. In a word, it changes its letter into spirit. To understand the Bible "spiritually" or to understand it "in an evangelical, gospel sense" is all one and same thing.[49] "Now the truth of the Holy Spirit shines without obstruction by any veil of the Old Testament."[50] Correlatively, from the day that this change was made, the first Testament found itself surpassed, obsolete, outdated — "antiquated"[51] in all the parts of its writings that were not in conformity to the new. If, then, one wanted to maintain the literal interpretation as a standard or benchmark, it would become "the letter that kills."[52] Henceforth this Old Testament no longer exists for the believer except in its relationship to the New Testament, which is to say that henceforth it has to be understood in its entirety "according to the spirit."[53] Doubtless this understanding was not meant to negate the interpretation of the Old Testament that was formerly arrived at "according to the letter,"[54] but was meant rather to oppose the interpretation of it that would be claimed to be given nowadays "according to the antiquated letter."[55] The ancient Jews, those, at least, who were faithful, understood the writings of Scripture, to the extent that God wanted them to understand it at the time. But those of them who refused to acknowledge the new covenant by refusing to acknowledge Jesus Christ lost their very understanding of these writings.[56] "Henceforth everything that is not understood by way of the Spirit which renews all things is old and antiquated."[57]

Now a transformation like this of the Old Testament in the New is not the consequence of an evolution of minds. Nor is it spread out in terms of duration. It comes to pass all at once. It is not a progression by stages. Although it has been prepared for, in the end it is an abrupt transition,[58] it is a wholesale transfer,[59] it is a change of register, by which everything takes on another meaning. Thanks to a new illumination, everything that constituted what today we call the Old Testament — persons, events, institutions, laws, temple, sacrifices, priesthood, etc. — appeared to be changed all of a sudden:

> The inward anxiety of my mind "disturbed me," on account of the sudden introduction of the New Testament for the Old, when,

> instead of the books of the prophets and the law, which I knew were divine and written by the Holy Spirit, the preaching of the Gospel suddenly filled the whole world.[60]

Properly speaking it is a shift or transformation:[61]

> There is a transformation of the way in which these things are understood, even though the way they are named does not change.[62]

For words denoting transformation and change recur constantly in the texts: "a change of law and of priesthood,"[63] "the transformation of the Old Testament into the New Testament."[64] To use a word that is even more expressive and no less frequent, it is a conversion[65] — a conversion of letter to spirit.[66]

A fact of this kind is not to be confused with the process that can be observed throughout the history not only of Israel, but also — with differences that this is not the place to analyze — in the history of other peoples: a process of spiritualization, of deepening on the basis of initial givens that date back to rougher times. Beryl Smalley wrote that:

> Allegorical interpretation marks a stage in the history of every civilized people whose sacred literature is primitive.

This is the means, in effect, by which is resolved the conflict that has become inevitable between the letter of that which is held to be normative and the demands of the new intellectual and moral situation.[67] Thus new problems receive an appropriate solution, and progress can be welcomed without the sacred bond being broken and without an alteration of the fervent attachment to venerable teachings or prescriptions. Thus, from a meditation on the ancient Scriptures "there issue forth new Scriptures, a curious mix of fidelity and imagination"; the expressions of a first author are taken up by another and given a new coloration.[68] Furthermore, everything is not always arbitrary in such a process and the historian often has leave to admire "such a living role that is played by tradition, which ceaselessly makes great works rise again, so that they bear fruit and are extended in time."[69] In the case of Israel, notably, the fact is beyond doubt. It has taken on a great amplitude, and it has borne beautiful fruits.[70] It has, moreover, been pursued, albeit in other conditions, in the bosom of Judaism, after the Christian era. But in this case we are speaking of another fact, one that comes later and is more decisive.

Since these facts happen to have been confounded, it is necessary to be somewhat insistent.

The most ancient feast days in Israel were agricultural feast days. They were retained, but transformed into feast days that commemorated the great events reported in the book of Exodus: the flight from Egypt, the gift of the Law, the wanderings in the desert, and the conquest of the Promised Land. But this historic reinterpretation was itself only a first step. At the time of the prophets, the nation's past was idealized, the providential significance became more pronounced and came to be the springboard to higher hopes. Henceforth history served as a key to understanding the present and transformed itself more and more into an allegory of the future. The favors that God visited on his people became the warrants for more precious favors. The old accounts took on a new symbolism. There was, as Jean Daniélou says, "a rooting of the typology in the Old Testament itself." There was, for example, a whole "prehistory of patristic interpretation of Exodus": the prophets themselves give notice of "a second Exodus, of which the first was a mere figurative symbol," just as they give notice of "a second cataclysm of which the first Flood was the figurative symbol."[71] For the author of the Book of Daniel, the destruction of the Tower of Babel prefigures the fall of Babylon, and for Ezekiel the description of the first paradise is projected onto his vision of the last Jerusalem. What is more, at the prompting of the Spirit, the sacred authors from generation to generation use the materials brought together by those of previous generations to herald a purer and more interior religion.

> By re-reading and meditating on the ancient texts in the light of recent events or new situations and then re-using them and reworking them, they were led to come to a clearer and deeper understanding of the theological content of these texts and thus to promote the progress of the revealed message.[72]

This is the case, in particular, for Jeremiah, for Deuteronomy, and for the second part of the Book of Isaiah. This "new song" constitutes "a new elaboration and blossoming" of the truths that had already seen the light of day in more ancient times, but had not yet borne their fruit. This is the case with the Song of Songs and Psalm 40, which re-use different themes taken from Hosea, Ezekiel, and second Isaiah to achieve a deeper appreciation of the idea of the union of Yahweh and Israel by making the most of the analogical union of man and woman. This is also the case with Ezekiel, as Renée Bloch has shown in a penetrating study: "Using the

materials received from his predecessors, the writer prophet has succeeded in constructing an original work, in order to communicate a new message that answers to the needs of his time." He has rethought "the whole history of Israel and the significance of its great events in relation to the present situation":

> We are in the presence of a reflection which, at a moment of confusion and disorder, anxiously consults with the past in order to find in it the illumination, the answers, the explanations, the assurances, and the hopes that the present, a particularly sombre present, requires. To this end, the prophet harmonizes various texts, especially from Hosea, Jeremiah, and Deuteronomy, in order to clarify them, explain them, and complete them mutually, and to make them react somehow in this mutual interplay . . . to make illumination that is partially new burst forth from them. . . . He takes up oracles of the past, but he inserts them into a whole that gives them a new meaning, a new importance — not *different* from that of the past, but a progressive addition to it — adapted to the needs of the present situation and in conformity with the mission that he has received. . . .[73]

This is precisely the midrashic genre whose importance grew in Israel beginning at the time of the exile and which invaded canonical and noncanonical literature.[74] Knowledge of this genre is indispensable for a sound exegesis of the New Testament.

Let us not suppose that an evolution like this totally escaped the notice of the ancient Christian commentators. They were well aware of one of the essential methods of the prophets: "It is a trademark of prophetic knowledge to recall deeds in order to help in the doing of deeds."[75] They also knew how to recognize the allegorization of previous history, the "mystery" of which was found to have been partially revealed from before the time of Christ. Thus we have Saint Augustine explaining Psalm 113:

> Listen to what is more marvelous: some of the hidden and veiled mysteries of the old books are revealed in part by the old books. For the prophet Micah says this: "As in the days when you came out of the land of Egypt I will show them marvellous things, etc." (Micah 7:15-19). Certainly you will notice, brothers, that the sacred mysteries are quite manifestly being laid open here. Thus, in this psalm, although the marvellous spirit of prophecy considers the future, it

> seems, nonetheless, to be recounting things as if they have already happened in the past.[76]

Thus the prophets have already "polished," if we can use such a term, the hearts of the men of their time, to make them catch a glimpse of some of what was foreshadowed by the most ancient history of Israel. According once again to Saint Augustine, this took place:

> so that we might believe that it was not merely apostolic authority that made those figures ours. But this notion was encompassed by the prophets themselves. Their eloquence was of a revelatory kind. Seeing and rejoicing in this revelatory eloquence, we may safely draw out of God's treasury new and old things that are harmoniously related in a mutually coherent arrangement.[77]

It was natural that Deuteronomy drew their attention in this regard. In observing that it enacts "a more evident legislation" than earlier texts, Origen had recognized it as a symbol of "evangelical precepts," that "second law that leads everything to perfection." He had seen it as "that law of the Gospel written in the heart of the believer who hears and retains the words of Christ." Extending his analysis, as was his custom, he had also supposed that it signified the second coming of Christ, which will be "more dazzling and glorious" than his first coming in the humble lineaments of flesh.[78] Others, who drop this latter application, retain the idea that Deuteronomy announced in a more strikingly true and forceful way: the promulgation of the Gospel, a true and definitive "second Law." We find terminology such as: "The Gospel signifies what can be called a second promulgation of the law"[79] and "the Deuteronomy of gospel truth."[80] Had not Saint Paul himself allowed it to be understood, by a subtle exegesis, that a passage from this book of Scripture contained "a prophetic announcement of gospel justice," a kind of "anticipation of the economy proclaimed by Christ"?[81]

Therefore it can be said that "between a biblical theme and its typological patristic exegesis" there are "a certain number of gradual stages that are comprised of the interpretations of this theme to be found in successive biblical authors."[82] Except that it is the author of these last lines who adds that the same theme can therefore be found taken up "by the Prophets, the Psalms, the Jewish Apocalypse, the New Testament, and finally the Fathers of the Church — so many times the theme is taken up by men who are turned towards the future." Now this is what the Fathers and their spiritual

heirs would have refused to endorse. In their eyes, the "moment" of the New Testament was not — and it could not be so in the eyes of any Christian — a simple moment in a series, a moment analogous to the "moments" of the Psalms, the Prophets, or the Jewish Apocalypse. In their eyes, this "moment" of the New Testament was — to borrow two words from Karl Barth — the "critical instant," which became the "eternal instant." It was the unique "kairos." The level of Deuteronomy was not fully comparable to it. It was no more true for them than it was for Saint Paul that it constituted a second Testament.[83] They were well aware that, while Saint Paul had been able to "extend" the meaning of the inspired writer without betraying it, this extension of meaning presupposed the unique intervention of the Fact of Christ. Those were writers who, like Origen, in their opposition to the heretic Gnostics, made a greater allowance for the revelations of the Logos before the time of his incarnation. But at the same time, these very writers felt more forcefully the congenital imperfection of our knowledge until the advent of the regime of the New Law, and they were not slow in proclaiming that the coming of the Logos in the flesh, and the Logos alone, constituted "The Coming of Truth."[84] With all the more reason, they themselves did not suppose that they were constituting a new "moment" in this coming. A thought of this kind could only have been rejected by them as a blasphemy. They did not take the initiative, in their turn, of interpreting the old texts other than by the past, and neither did they project into the past the new interpretation received from the witnesses to Jesus: they were entirely enthralled by their admiration for the unique, unsurpassable Newness, utterly special and transfiguring everything it touched, that in their eyes constituted the "New Testament." And if they were, in fact, very much oriented toward the future, since every Christian awaits the glorious return of Christ, this was no longer in the manner of the ancient seers of Israel, for they knew that Christ has come, and they were not awaiting another Christ, of whom the Christ of the Gospel would still have been only a kind of prefiguration.[85] Henceforth all their hope could be "none other than the present gift of Jesus Christ."[86] Prepared "from the beginning of the age" by a whole series of stages, salvation had finally come. The transition from shadows to truth had taken place:

> Truth puts the shadows to flight!
> Light gives illumination to the night![87]

Suddenly the Lord had appeared, coming out from the dense forest of allegories, the gloom of which had not been broached up to that

point.[88] This is what none of the stages that had marked the progress of Israel's religion had yet accomplished. Without the Lord, who was destined to appear at the end term of all this, all these stages would have been fruitless and ineffectual. "They would be running in vain, if they were not boasting of Christ."[89] And by contrast with this end term, it had to be said indistinctly of all these stages: "all the time before the coming of the Savior remained empty and useless, as it were."[90] This is the illumination that had not yet been procured by any of the successive "re-readings" of the Holy Books. None of these "re-readings" was comparable to the "re-reading" made henceforth in the Word and in his Spirit. The "newness of the Gospel" was thus something other than a higher level or rung in an ascent that would need to be continued.[91] Without a doubt, it did not change the conditions imposed on our outlook by our present existence in the flesh. In this sense, it had to be said yet that we were still walking amid "shadows and appearances." At least we were living henceforth "in the shadow of Christ."[92] The Lord Jesus was the unique and incomparable summit: "the mountain of mountains, not one of the mountains."[93] In him, Scripture in its entirety had "once and for all" received its fulfillment. Moses and Aaron had lived. Following the true Joshua, Christians had entered into the promised land of the Gospel.[94] Now they could work hard, in the cheerful boldness of their faith, to relate in detail the great allegory of Scripture. They were well aware that in this endless task they were not in any way extending or completing the total allegorization that had been made once and for all by Christ.

2. The Action of Christ

It is sometimes said that in order to understand biblical revelation properly it is necessary to have some sense of history, some sense of evolution, that is to say, some notion of the continuity of God's work in time, the uninterrupted continuity of a homogeneous historical development.[1] No assessment could be fairer, so long as one does not ignore, in this very continuity and evolution, "history's character of perpetual creation . . . wherein it is God who acts";[2] so long as one knows how to recognize biblical revelation as "a series of successive transpositions,"[3] transpositions "that are veritable metamorphoses."[4] But at the same time no assessment could be more incomplete. The history of revelation also offers the spectacle of a discontinuity that has no equal, which makes the traditional

idea of allegory, understood in its most profound essence, irreplaceable. This idea was much more than "the expression of a prophetism of progress," as people sometimes say, echoing Edward Caird, and the "theory of evolution," therefore, cannot be sufficient to relay it.[5] In a sense, it is true, the continuity still remains and one can even say that it is "faultless." Nothing was "improvised." Jesus Christ did not come on the scene "all of a sudden," without preparations, into the middle of an entirely hostile or strange world.[6] The Old Testament was an outline, a rough sketch, a "first draft,"[7] as it were. The New Testament is the fruit of a supernatural tree whose roots and trunk and leaves were the Old Testament, and "it is through the Law that one arrives at the Gospel."[8] The light that bursts forth from the Gospel had begun to gleam in the Law: "Whatever sheds light in the Old Testament flashes forth radiantly in the New Testament."[9] But in another sense, the break is a radical one.[10] The new covenant is not like the old covenant.[11] The people of God would no longer be an ethnic group. The Divine Presence would no longer be localized in one spot, in a material tabernacle. From now on God would be in Jesus Christ and everywhere. To explain such a contrast, it does not suffice to say that "Israel's soul has matured."[12] The transposition that takes place at this point constitutes "a newness and an overstepping of boundaries as complete as an assumption and fulfillment."[13] Incommensurable with the "perpetual creation" that could be observed up to that point is the "new creation" that consummates it.

Nevertheless, let us recognize that this case is unique, beyond the bounds of all likeness and all analogy. In human history, there are not two "fullnesses of time." In the history of revelation, moreover, there are not a whole series of graduated testaments: after the Old Testament, there are no more testaments except for the New. Even if there were several transitions, there was only one transition, however, the final one, which forever merits the name of "Easter."[14] Only then do we find that "Moses died,"[15] so that another, higher life might take the place of his. Up to that point, it was a time of "shadows." Now "Truth" has come on the scene.[16] Previously it was "the Law and the Prophets." Henceforth it is "the Kingdom of God."[17] Also, whatever may be the astonishing, disconcerting statements which the historian finds himself constrained to make, statements which can put him in the realm of affirmations that are no longer answerable to history alone, a case such as this, more than any other, will, in its singularity, always escape the ken of anyone who does not assume the point of view of faith. The conversion of the Old Testament to the New or of the letter of Scripture to its spirit can only be explained and

justified, in its radicalness, by the all-powerful and unprecedented intervention of Him who is Himself at once the Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last.[18] It could not have happened other than "through the workings of Christ."[19] "Ancient Word,"[20] "the one born before the ages," and "the one come at the end of time,"[21] Jesus Christ can say, at the moment of the Incarnation: "It is I who speak; here am I."[22] Furthermore, he can say in truth: "Before Abraham was, before Adam was, I am."[23] "Seed of Abraham, creator of Abraham"; "Lord of the prophets, fulfiller of the prophets"[24]; "prototype" of all those who, having appeared before him on the biblical stage, can only be "types" in relation to him,[25] he is at once he "from whom and through whom all prophecy exists."[26] Moreover, he is the Master of the First Testament as he is of the Second. He has made them for each other. He separates them and reunites them in himself. Thus, if such a transition can be made from one to the other, it is because it is a "transition to Christ"[27] and concurrently a "transition that is effected in Christ."[28] If all the "clouds" are dispelled all at once, perhaps this is only by virtue of the unparalleled burst of brightness that is the bright burst of Christ: "On account of his bright glory, the clouds dissipated at the sight of him."[29] If truth takes the place of shadowy darkness by a sudden illumination, it is because that Truth which shines in Christ has come into play: "the Truth of God has appeared in Jesus alone."[30] If there is a "transformation," it is because it happens through Christ.[31] "He did not nullify those ancient signs of things by argument, but he transformed them by fulfilling them."[32] If there is a "change," this change can only be the fact of Christ:

> Coming in the flesh, the Lord changed all the shadowy ceremonies of the Mosaic law by turning them to the light of spiritual life.[33]

If there is a transfer,[34] it is that Jesus Christ, entering into the Holy of Holies, sends us his Spirit.[35] If there is total renewal, it is because the Newness of Christ has intervened. On this subject the celebrated words of Saint Irenaeus are well known: "by bringing himself he brought all newness."[36] Saint Ambrose says the same thing, in a formula that is no less energetic: "The Lord Jesus came . . . and what was old was made new."[37] If the result of such a "moulting process" is not only total but definitive, if the "Christian meaning of the Bible" is to be found "affirmed henceforth and forever,"[38] it is because, in fact, God has, in successive stages, "led his people in anticipation of Someone."[39] All of biblical history and all of biblical reality had Christ for its unique end.

The law is a shadow of what is to come,
Christ is the promised end,
He is the consummation of all things![40]

The old law confirms the new and the new law fulfills the old;
The old things are hopeful, the new are faith-filled;
But the grace of Christ binds together the old and the new.[41]

In short, the spirit of the letter is Christ.[42] The Gift prophesied by the Law is Christ.[43] "The New Testament is Christ."[44] "The Gospel is Christ."[45] "The breath that comes from our mouth is Christ the Lord."[46]

Therefore, Jesus Christ brings about the unity of Scripture, because he is the endpoint and fullness of Scripture. Everything in it is related to him. In the end he is its sole object. Consequently, he is, so to speak, its whole exegesis. According to Saint Augustine, this is what is meant by mention of the phrase "with a view to the end,"[47] which can often be found in the heading of psalms: "When you hear the text of the psalm saying, 'with a view to the end,' let your hearts turn to Christ."[48] Scripture leads us to him, and when we reach this end, we no longer have to look for anything beyond it.[49] Cornerstone that he is, he joins together the two Testaments, just as he joins together the two peoples.[50] He is the Head of the body of the Scriptures, just as he is the Head of the body of His Church. He is the Head of all sacred understanding, just as he is the head of all the elect.[51] He is the whole content of Scripture, just as he contains all of it in him:

> The whole body of Divine Scripture, both the Old and the New Testaments, contain the Son of God. . . . In him is contained all the Law, both old and new.[52]

> All of Divine Scripture is one book, and that one book is Christ, because all of Divine Scripture speaks of Christ, and all of Divine Scripture is fulfilled in Christ.[53]

> The Word of God, the only-begotten Son of God, Our Lord Jesus Christ . . . seems to be a great mainstay of truth, if anyone can interpret Sacred Scripture in such a way that he is mindful of the mystery of it, namely, the Lord himself, who established it.[54]

But this unity in Christ includes yet another aspect, which reveals it even more forcibly. Inasmuch as he is the exegesis of Scripture, Jesus Christ

is also the exegete. He is truly Scripture's Logos, in an active as well as a passive sense:[55] "Christ, who alone unlocks an understanding of the Scriptures."[56] It is he alone who explains it to us, and in explaining it to us, he gives an explanation of himself: "The Book opens itself on its own."[57] And who, in fact, other than he himself, could be a better interpreter of himself?[58] It is he and he alone who shows us how, from one end to another, Scripture in its entirety signifies nothing other than the Gospel, that is to say, himself.[59] Even during the time when he lived on earth, he said to the Jews who questioned him: "You search the Scriptures . . . and it is they that bear witness to me."[60] Nevertheless, this could only be by way of anticipation. But one evening, on the road to Emmaus, we see him giving a more explicit teaching to the two men who were traveling with him on the way: "beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself."[61] And this second time, unlike the first, presupposes the accomplishment of the mystery. "More and more, the Savior began to reveal the mystery of his Passion, and there is no problem harmonizing this with the Gospel."[62] In this case, he conveys to the understanding an explanation which has been fulfilled in its substance. He invites us to see what has just had light shed on it for all time.

This is because Christ's exegesis, insofar as it is essential and decisive, does not consist of words first and foremost. It is actual. It is Action.

> For every doubt is taken away, and the truth is proclaimed, when the truth is proved not by words, but by actual things.[63]

Before explaining to his disciples on Easter evening how the ancient Scripture bears witness to the New Testament and thus comes to be changed into it, Jesus brings about this change. In other words, the prophecies and the figures are made clear by their very fulfillment — and it could not be otherwise. The mysteries of Scripture are "revealed in action."[64] Such, according to Saint Jerome in his translation of Origen, is the double significance of the Greek word used by Saint Luke at the beginning of his Gospel, a word that can only be translated by the conjoined words "fulfilled" and "manifested."[65] "The night will be illumined like day," sings the Psalmist. This is what happens when the Lord comes.[66] At that point "the Gate that faces East opens up, and from it the true Light radiates forth."[67] At that point, "the Old Testament was opened up, and the spiritual understanding that was hidden in it was revealed to believers."[68] "Christ is the illuminator of ancient things."[69]

Jesus is thus a scriptural exegete by virtue of himself, by virtue of all his being, and by virtue of all his mystery. He is an exegete, in principle, from the moment of his Incarnation. This is what Origen explained in the fourth book of his *Periarchôn*, which is too often taken for a treatise on hermeneutics in the narrow sense of the word, as if the only matter discussed in it were the *books* of the Bible and not first and foremost the very *realities* of the twin Testaments:

> The brightness of the coming of Christ illuminated the law of Moses with the shining splendor of truth and lifted the veil that had been placed over the letter. For everyone who believed in him he unlocked all the good things that were enclosed in it.[70]

We can, however, speak in less general terms. Jesus is a scriptural exegete par excellence in the act by which he fulfills his mission, at that solemn hour for which he has come: in his sacrificial action, at the hour of his death on the cross. That is why he says, in effect: "Behold, I make all things new."[71] That is why he *kills* the shadows and images in terms of their literal meaning and why he makes known the spirit in which the faithful should live.[72] What we have here is a divine alchemy that alone realizes the "virtue of the Lord's passion."[73] "While the Savior hung on the cross, the understanding of Holy Scripture spread throughout the world."[74] In pronouncing the words "it is finished" on that gibbet which is a symbolic representation of the last letter of the Hebrew alphabet, Jesus imparts to all of Scripture its fulfillment.[75]

> In this way he reveals the whole mystery of man's redemption, which was to be found in hidden form in the twenty-two books of the Old Testament.[76]

His Cross is the sole and universal key.[77] By this sacrament of the Cross, he unites the two Testaments into a single body of doctrine, intermingling the ancient precepts with the grace of the Gospel.[78] By dying, the Lion of Judah obtains the victory that opens the Book with seven seals.[79] He penetrates into the Temple that contains the holy ark.[80] He rends the veil that covered the mysteries of grace.[81] In one stroke, he shows the profound meaning of what was written,[82] and at the same time he opens the eyes of those who place no obstacles in the way, for they need eyes to see this: "through his death he opened the eyes of our mind."[83]

Thus the light of truth bursts forth doubly from the Cross.[84] All of

tradition repeats this: "he reveals the spiritual understanding,"[85] "he promotes a spiritual understanding of the eloquence of Sacred Scripture,"[86] "he transforms the shadowy world of figurative expressions into truth,"[87] "he puts an end to the literal and ascribes pre-eminence to a new, spiritual understanding."[88] What the rod of Moses had accomplished figuratively by striking the rock is accomplished in very truth by a thrust of the centurion's lance:

> If Jesus had not been struck, if blood and water had not flowed from his side, all of us would still be suffering from thirst for the Word of God.[89]

Here, then, on Calvary we have the great, open Book of the Divine Plan that is henceforth legible by everyone:

> The divine mind is a great book. . . . The Book of Revelation and Isaiah bear the stamp of that book, and Ezekiel is fed by its open pages. . . . In that book Esdras reads distinctly and openly about the wooden stair of the cross; when the soldier opened Jesus' side with a lance, all the windows of the Christian faith were lit up with blood and water, so that there was nothing covered up that was not revealed. . . .[90]

Here is "a turning of the page that clarifies everything, like that great illustrated leaf on the missal. Here, painted in red, is the great Page that separates the two Testaments! All the doors open at once, all the conflicts vanish, all the contradictions are resolved":[91]

> That light from on high falls onto earth,
> And drives off the wretched darkness of death;
> Something new is displayed; the old is revealed:
> Now nothing is left closed up and hidden under the letter.[92]

Just as "universal recapitulation" has been accomplished by the sacrifice of Jesus,[93] so, similarly, we find that the ancient Scriptures have been definitively opened and condensed. But also, just as the sacrifice of Jesus is completed by the Resurrection, which is no longer separable from his death, so it is the Resurrection that consummates its double effect.[94] The one who opens the Book is indissolubly "the Lamb who was slain and the Lion who comes back to life."[95] In leaving the tomb, Christ sets aside the

stone that covered it, that stone of the letter which, up to that point, was an obstacle in the free flow of the spiritual understanding, that stone which he had already prophetically caused to be removed from the tomb of Lazarus.[96] As the new Jacob, he takes the cover off the well, so that the whole world may henceforth drink deeply from these waters.[97]

The Action of Christ in fulfilling the Scriptures and conferring on them, at the same time, the fullness of their meaning is still compared by Christian tradition to the act of eucharistic consecration. For, in truth, Scripture is bread, but for the Christian this bread does not become the living food that it ought to be until it has been consecrated by Jesus:

> . . . Therefore, it was then that the Lord Jesus took the bread of Scripture in his hands, at the point when, having become incarnate according to the Scriptures, he suffered and rose; at that point, I say, he took the bread and gave thanks, when, to fulfill the Scriptures, he offered himself up to the Father as a sacrifice of grace and truth.[98]

3. The Harmony of the Two Testaments

The Church emerged from the side of Jesus at Calvary. Living by faith in his Resurrection and animated by his Spirit, which was received at Pentecost, the Church took the place of Israel from that point on. She is Abraham's posterity,[1] the only one in possession of his heritage, for "nobody will be able to receive Abraham's heritage, except those whose way of thinking is in utter conformity with the faith of Abraham through an acknowledgment of all the mysteries."[2] She now possesses, in her living reality, "the truth of figurative expressions."[3] She is the "just Remnant" announced by Isaiah. She is that "people of the New Covenant" promised by Jeremiah, that Israel "raised from the dead" which is contemplated in a vision by Ezekiel, that "people of the secrets of the Most High" prophesied by the Book of Daniel.[4] Whereas the city that has become unfaithful is now only "Sodom and Egypt," the new Jerusalem inscribes the name of the twelve tribes on its twelve mystical gates.[5] Her head men, the twelve Apostles, are the twelve true sons of Jacob. From everywhere they gather together "those who are redeemed," whom ancient Israel had had it as its mission both to represent and prepare. The book is now in their hands. It belongs by right to these new people, because they are the people of Christ: "This is my portion, for I believe in Christ."[6] The great transition has taken place. All the "sacramental mysteries" have been accomplished.[7] The

Church takes the place of the Synagogue. The Synagogue, which has become blind and sterile, is merely her librarian: "the Jew bears the book that is the basis of what the Christian believes."[8] "Your books," said Saint Justin to Trypho the Jew, "or, I should say, ours: for we are the ones who follow their line of thought. As for yourselves, you read them without understanding what they mean."[9]

Now it is in the Spirit that the Church, the "true Israel," the "spiritual Israel,"[10] receives her heritage and understands this heritage in truth. The "true" meaning of Scripture, its full and definitive meaning, cannot be other than the one "that the Spirit gives to the Church."[11] If, then, the Jews still hold to the letter, it is the Christians who, in holding to the spirit, hold to everything.[12] They are the true Deuteronomy, the one that consists of "the volume of the heart," "a mystical understanding," and "a purer intellectual understanding."[13] Henceforth the ark of the covenant is theirs: "The glory has departed from Israel, for the ark of God has been captured."[14] Showing a subtle sense of equilibrium and ruled by a very sure instinct, the Church has thus affirmed right from the beginning "the precise and indissoluble interdependence of the Old and New Testaments."[15] This is an idea to which she would adhere throughout her history. Balking at the temptations that assailed her right from the start and that would recur endlessly, she would unwaveringly oppose those who wanted to reject the Old Book, no less than those who wanted to restore it to the letter. For "the virtue of the Gospel is to be found in the Law," and this Law cannot grow old "for anyone who lays it open to the meaning of the Gospel." Furthermore, "for us both Testaments are a New Testament not because of their temporal age, but because of the newness of their understanding,"[16] and whoever accepts one to the exclusion of the other would by that very action become "a stranger to God's Testament."[17]

All of Israel comes to life again mysteriously in the Church, with its history, its characters, its struggles, its trials, its destiny, and its hopes. In the Church, the heavens of Scripture, no less than the visible heavens, participate in the universal harmony,[18] that harmony which still denotes the covenant established between God and man by the redemptive incarnation.[19] For the two Testaments are "brothers."[20] They are the two wings that lift the Church up.[21] Thus, between the two, there is always to be discovered a connection,[22] a harmony, "a concordance,"[23] "a consonance,"[24] "an appropriateness,"[25] "a congruence," "a consensus,"[26] "a concerted unity."[27] It is "an harmonious agreement"[28] that will never cease being affirmed in its entirety. There will always be a desire to verify and decipher it, or at least to illustrate it, to find significance in its least details,

through a second degree symbolism. The contradistinguishing phrases "but in those times" and "now, however"[29] are succeeded by the inclusive phrases "already then" and "and now."[30] In the first times, it was necessary for the contrast to be blameworthy. Did not the Old Testament itself pronounce this:

> Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not like the covenant which I made with their fathers.[31]

Saint Paul's commentary is well known, particularly in his Letter to the Hebrews. On the one hand, there is the fiery tempest, burning darkly, which made Moses tremble on Sinai. On the other hand, we have Mount Zion and the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem with its innumerable angels, that "festal gathering" where all those who have been purified by the blood of Jesus are welcomed in peace.[32] Saint Augustine himself comments on this commentary: "there we find smoke, here we find bright fire."[33] This is what causes us to perceive a "plain and evident distance" between the Old Testament and the New.[34] But at the selfsame moment when the New Testament creates the contrast, it suppresses it. Immediately the distance is bridged. The Old Testament is itself found to be unified, and the two Testaments, in their union, no longer have more than one voice.[35] "Christ is to be found in them, because Christ himself constitutes their harmonious agreement."[36] As soon as the Gospel rang forth, the Prophets and Apostles formed one, united choir, and the believer contemplates them in their admirable conjunction.[37] "For Holy Scripture as a whole is coherent, and is united together in one spirit."[38]

How many other analogous texts could be cited! Sometimes commentators are more inclined to highlight the contrast, while at other times the harmony comes to the fore. But, for all that, they do not contradict one another, and most of them convey the notion of transition from the first moment to the second. Thus we have this hymn for Pentecost by Adam of Saint Victor:

> The law came first by way of figures,
> The penal law, the shadowy law,
> Then the light of the Gospel.
> Let the spiritual understanding,
> Covered by the leaves of the letter,
> Come forth into public view![39]

And how many doctors other than Saint Hilary could be extolled in a fashion that is similar to what we encounter in this Poitiers sequence:

> The enigmas of the prophets
> And the figurative expressions of Scripture:
> He harmonized them all
> With the words of the evangelists![40]

Here we are more interested in the principle than in the details, the ingenuity of which presupposes a cast of mind that has become quite alien to us. Without a doubt this principle forms the basic foundation for a system of apologetics, a system whose living reality would be preserved by the permanence of Judaism at the very heart of Christianity, not to mention the perpetual revivals of Gnosticism and Manichaeism. Origen's thoughts were constantly turning to these two enemies, which are opposed to the Christian synthesis. Saint Gregory the Great was also thinking of them — at least he presented them as the background to his thought — when he wrote:

> The Catholic Church receives the New Testament in such a way that it does not reject the Old. She venerates the Old Testament in such a way that she is ever perceiving the spirit of the New Testament even in the fleshly sacrifices.[41]

Often, moreover, medieval exegetes are mindful of them as well, as if they were an ever present danger.[42] Thus the "calumnies" directed against Scripture[43] and the Christian faith are repulsed. But there is a fair bit more. Throughout all of Christian exegesis and already in certain exclamations of Saint Paul, something other than defensive argumentation can be perceived: accents of triumphal joy. That "wondrous harmony in the way God works,"[44] that "consonant truth of both Testaments"[45] is admired, relished, and celebrated for itself. The light that is emitted puts the understanding in a festive mood. The imagination is set afire, in the service of a first intuition that would always be stronger and broader than all its ingenious contrivances. The Christian who meditates on Scripture enjoys it as he would enjoy music;[46] and even more than the music of the spheres, more than the "song of the universe,"[47] this harmonious concert of the Testaments finally establishes him in a state of contemplative peace, as in an ecstatic sleep.[48] The centuries pass without having any effect. The wonderment is always new. The "new song" is always resounding.[49] The

"glorious face of Moses" is ever the object of the same fascination.[50] "See how the Gospel harmonizes with the Law![51] You see that the mysteries are in mutual agreement everywhere!"[52] It is Origen who talked this way. Here is Saint Bernard nine centuries later: "You see how beautiful and harmonious . . . is their mutual agreement!"[53] "You see, brothers, how great is the unity of the Scriptures!"[54] And Geoffrey Babion exclaims: "Behold to what an extent the Old and New Testaments harmonize!"[55]

Such agreement is something unique, which no example could properly account for, although the vocabulary with which it is defined is borrowed from music and receives certain elucidations from it. This agreement does not consist of a simple parallelism, or of a simple hierarchy, but of a veritable unity. But a unity of this kind is not, to be sure, a confusion. What we are dealing with is a consonance, that is to say, a harmony that is realized by a convergence between things that are at first glance dissimilar and recognized as such.[56] We are also dealing with a marvelous peace, established in the wake of a war, a war that is, at least, apparent.[57] We are dealing with a symphony, "a sweet blending together of mutually disparate voices,"[58] with a rigorous fittingness, an organic composition, a flawless balance between the two parts of the Book. "The old law is congruent with the new. Moses is the same as an Apostle."[59] The fabric of the New Law is woven, as it were, with the thread of the Old.[60] It is a bond, moreover, that is comparable to the nuptial bond[61] or the bond between brothers.[62]

The definition of this bond is given to us in a series of formulas, all of which come to the same thing, but whose abundance and variety are significant in terms of the analogy. We find that it is the Latins in particular who have hit on these formulas. Saint Augustine, stimulated by Tyconius, seems to have been the principal crafter of them. In the *De catechizandis rudibus* he says: "The New Testament is hidden in the Old. The Old Testament is manifested in the New."[63] In a sermon he says: "The Old Testament is the promise expressed in figures, while the New Testament is the promise understood in a spiritual way."[64] And in another sermon he says: "You can see the Old Testament revealed in the New and the New Testament veiled in the Old,"[65] etc. A short while later, Primasius, who also depends on Tyconius, explains for his part why one should refuse ever to receive one of the two Testaments without the other: "For the Old Testament is the herald and veil of the New, and the New Testament is the fulfillment and revelation of the Old."[66] Then we have Saint Gregory, who borrows an image that will become particularly celebrated from the first vision of Ezekiel:

> The wheel within the wheel is the New Testament . . . it is inside the Old Testament, because the New Testament openly showed what the Old Testament had merely traced out.[67]

Saint Bede remarks that all the doctors before him had already observed that: "The Old Testament is elucidated in the New, the New is foreshadowed in the Old."[68] In his commentary on the Book of Revelation, Beatus of Liebana takes up the symbolic framework used by Saint Gregory in order to draw this condensed formula from it: "The prophecy of the New Testament is the Old Testament; and explanation of the Old Testament is the New Testament."[69] We find the same symbolic approach, explained in a similar fashion, in Saint Ambrose Autpert:

> For what is the wheel within a wheel other than the New Testament revealed in the Old? . . . For this reason, the Old and New Testaments are said to be one book, because the New Testament cannot be distinguished from the Old, nor, yet again, can the Old be distinguished from the New. For the Old Testament is the herald and veil of the New. Indeed, the New Testament is the fulfillment and revelation of the Old.[70]

This is a combination of Gregory and Primasius. Equivalent formulas can be found in Rabanus Maurus,[71] in Aimo of Auxerre,[72] and in Claudius of Turin, who concludes: "Everything resounds with newness."[73] The same can be found in Bruno of Segni,[74] Richard of Saint Victor,[75] Wolberon,[76] and many others. Letbert of Saint Ruf writes: "The Old Testament is the prophecy of the New, and the New Testament is the explanation of the Old,"[77] which is very nearly the same formula as that of Beatus. And Hervé du Bourg Dieu says: "If the Old Testament is understood spiritually, there are no discrepancies with the New Testament."[78] No one found a more expressive variation than Berengaud, in his explication of the Book of Revelation. He does not, for example, say merely that "the New Testament is an unveiling of the Old Testament,"[79] but twice he has the following perfect formula, which, although quite similar to the one used by Saint Gregory that was taken up by Beatus, has a more pregnant quality to it: "The spiritual understanding in the Old Testament is none other than the New Testament."[80] Saint Augustine, it is true, had also said of the Law that "when it is understood spiritually, it is the gospel."[81] And earlier still, Origen, too, declared that "all of Divine Scripture is the Gospel."[82]

If this is the way things are, the corpus of the Jewish Scriptures has unrestricted entry into the collective body of the Christian Scriptures. As there is only one Word, one Utterance, there is only one Scripture, one Book.[83] "The whole of Scripture is one book of the most sweet and delightful kind."[84] The two Testaments "are one,"[85] and once more the working principle of their unity is Christ: "they are found to be of one heart and one mind in the unity of Christ — Christ himself is their consensus."[86] The union of the first collection with the second sanctifies the unity of all the parts that come to make this first collection an integral whole and that are, humanly speaking, sometimes so disparate:

> The instances of divine eloquence, although they are distinct in terms of their time frames, are nonetheless united in terms of their several meanings.[87]

Thus, the same thing could be said of all the inspired books taken together, as is said, for example, of the different prophetic books. As the many churches form one Church, and as the different heavens form one Heaven, all these works form one entity "in a wonderful, divine unity."[88] These affirmations were all the more remarkable in that the Holy Books — "the numerous volumes of Scripture"[89] — had not yet been gathered together in a definitive canon, which conferred a kind of visible and material unity on the Bible. It was spoken of as if it were two collections, divine or "celestial" Scriptures and human scriptures.[90] People devoted themselves to the study "of all the Divine Scriptures"; they spoke of "a succession of Divine Scriptures" or "the whole order of the Sacred Scriptures."[91] In the second half of the twelfth century, John of Salisbury found himself obliged to examine the question of the number of books that make up the two Testaments, in order to satisfy a correspondent.[92] The Scriptures were not yet called "the Bible," but "the Library" or "the heavenly library."[93] It was affirmed, however, that "the whole Library is one book, which is veiled at the outset, but made clear and manifest at the end."[94]

Outside and inside, before and after, shadow and substance, figurative expression and truth, letter and spirit, prophecy and realization. At length we have two Testaments. The unity of these paired phrases is the same unity, and the understanding of one is that of each of the others.[95] It is a unique mystery, but with undefined resonances, the multifarious expression of which can be found everywhere in the writings of the Fathers and those who read them. It is at the center of their exegesis. It governs their

whole doctrine of the biblical senses. It is what inspires someone like Saint Hilary to use the following formulas equivalently: "spiritual understanding," "spiritual prearrangement," "prefigurative significance," "the prearrangement of the Church."[96] It inspires someone like Saint Augustine to use words like: "prophesying," "prediction,"[97] and "allegorical prefiguration."[98] It is what causes someone like Gaudentius of Brescia to discern, in the factual account that was recalled by Exodus, an historical understanding proper to the Jews, "right up to the coming of Christ," as well as a spiritual understanding that should reign supreme today.[99] It is what makes someone like Saint Gregory of Elvira, in his explication of the Bible, say:

> We are trying to demonstrate that the force of all the deeds that were done and the spiritual rationale for them were related to a prefiguring of the New Testament.[100]

In the same sense, Saint Isidore of Seville speaks of a "mystery of prefiguration" and of "promissory figures,"[101] just as Saint Augustine had spoken of "prophetic sacraments"[102] and Quodvultdeus of "prefigured promises."[103] Baldwin of Canterbury refers to a "mystical token of the truth that would follow sometime in the future."[104] Scripture itself, says Berengaud, challenges us to this spiritual understanding of all that it tells us. Like the Gospel of Saint John, Scripture tells us to "come and see," which is to say:

> Do not come with physical steps, but with mental steps, and understand spiritually what you read as having been done historically in time.[105]

The tradition would reiterate it indefinitely: "The old things are historically ordered in such a way that all that is new might be revealed."[106] It would reiterate this not only in words or writings, but also in images. It is widely known how our great medieval art has shown these correspondences through sculpture and stained glass. Suger himself recounted how he had commissioned a series of stained-glass windows for the Basilica of Saint Denis and how for each of them he had composed a legend in verse. For example:

> Just as the bronze serpent kills all the serpents,
> So does Christ, when he is raised on the cross, kill the enemy;[107]

or:

> He who is God in his greatness, the Lion, unbinds the book and the Lamb. . . .[108]

The altar, the chalices, and the other religious objects were also adorned with what Suger calls "agreeable allegories,"[109] always with one or two explanatory verses, which followed the old formula of versified mottos[110] that came from the inscriptions of Damasus:

> The flesh of Christ seals what Abram sacrifices instead of his son.
> Those who seek Christ and his cross support their grapevine with a pole.[111]

In a sketch that is to be found in his *Hortus deliciarum*, which summarizes, with originality, the symbolism of his times, Herrad of Landsberg portrayed "two veiled heads, joined by a stole that is crossed over the chest and then draped over the back," with the following inscription: "The Old and New Testaments joined together."[112] In 1181, it was the same inspiration that guided Nicholas of Verdun, a goldsmith in the Meuse valley, when he fashioned the famous enameled ambo of the Augustinian abbey of Klosternenburg in Lower Austria: "this is the most complete typological cycle bequeathed to us by the twelfth century." Like other old works, the small tableaux that compose it are laid out not on two registers, but on three, each mystery of the New Testament being framed by two scenes from the Old Testament which prefigure it, the first having been borrowed from the time when nature's law held sway, the second from the time of the Mosaic law. Thus the Baptism of Christ is shown as having been prefigured at once by the crossing of the Red Sea and by the bronze basin that was held up by twelve oxen in the temple of Solomon, while his Ascension is bracketed by the ascensions of Enoch, Elijah, etc.[113] This is also the device adopted by the *Speculum humanae salvationis* (1324), a work that would be in vogue for more than two centuries. Quite a while earlier, at Saint Gall, Ekkehard IV (ca. 980-1060) had already composed his *Versus ad picturas*. There he described with some verisimilitude, it was thought, a series of alternate scenes from both Testaments, such as he saw them painted at that time on the walls of the cathedral at Mainz or perhaps even on the walls of his own church.[114] Much earlier still, when Benedict Biscop, founder of Wearmouth and Yarrow, who made the journey from Rome six times, returned to England for the fourth time in 684,[115] he

brought, in addition to a new lot of books, a collection of great symbolic images, "whose composition was superbly well thought out,"[116] as Bede tells us, and whose object it was to promote popular comprehension of this admirable "harmony" between the Testaments.

Without harking back to the art of the very first centuries, let us examine some older examples of art nonetheless. A poet of the sixth century whose identity is uncertain and who was perhaps Rusticus Helpidius Domnulus, a friend of Sidonius Apollinaris, who died as bishop of Lyons (501-2), composed some tristichs that have a one-to-one correspondence, the linkage being sometimes one of opposition (Tower of Babel — Pentecost), and at other times one of direct prefiguration (the sacrifice of Isaac — the crucifixion of Jesus). The adverb "here," which recurs several times in these verses, as well as their very brevity, which sometimes renders them scarcely intelligible, seems to be a good indication that they must have been inscribed at the bottom of mural paintings: the legend and the picture are mutually illuminating.[117] The genre was in imitation of the quatrains that form the *Dittochaeon* (= "double food," "double nourishment"[118]) of Prudentius, which were also probably meant to illustrate images.[119] In Rome, in the apses of Saint Constantius, one can still see, on a mosaic, Moses receiving the tables of the Law, while on another mosaic a companion piece to the former, Peter receives the Gospel from the hands of Christ: "a correlation between the two Covenants,"[120] which can be interpreted in many ways. Let us end this paragraph with some extracts from two poems in which, with obliging kindness, Saint Paulinus of Nola describes the paintings that adorn his dear Basilica of Saint Felix. In the first extract, the poet invites his friend Nicetas to lift up his head and contemplate them:

> Now I want you to see the long column of pictures
> In the colored porticos, and weary for a while your up-
> Turned neck, while you read everything with your head turned back.
> Whoever sees these things, acknowledging the truth in these simple figures,
> Will not feed his faith and mind with an empty image.
> For the picture holds everything in a faithful series,
> What the elder Moses wrote in five volumes,
> The things that he wrought, sealed as he was by the name of the Lord Jesus.
> Under his leadership, the raging current of the Jordan was suspended
> and its waters were fixed in a heap as it drew back from the face of the divine ark.[121]

The second poem subtly interweaves the relationship between the two successive Testaments with the relationship between the old church at Nola and the new:

> Our new thing takes its rise from the old impulse,
> And the customary solemn rites are enriched by an unaccustomed ceremony.[122]

After having led us to admire the porticos and interior of the basilica transformed by his care, Paulinus comes to the paintings with which he has adorned it:

> . . . And let us marvel at the sacred, monumental figures of the Ancients,
> And let us read two Testaments in the compass of three spaces,[123]
> And let us approach the reason for this in its proper light,
> Inasmuch as the new law is depicted in ancient dwellings,
> And the ancient law is depicted in a new abode:
> For we derive an equally useful glory from whatever is new in the old as from whatever is old in the new.[124]

4. The Symbols of Harmony

Numerous symbols taken from Scripture itself express this mystery of the two Testaments. First of all, there are, of course, those that could already be found being used as such in certain passages of the New Testament: in particular, the Pauline symbol of the veil that covered the face of Moses, that veil of the letter which formerly hid the secret of the spirit, which finds its expression through the facial features.[1] But there are many others besides. Some of them signify only the first aspect of the mystery or its first phase: the effacement of the Old Testament in its literal dimension. Thus Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist, enters into the temple "at the hour of incense," which is the time when night is coming on, because, as the sun set then behind the temple, even so was night falling on the Jewish religion. The day of the law was growing dim, in order to give way to the dawn of the Gospel.[2] Or else those clouds which in Nahum's prophecy are the dust from the Lord's feet represent the transitory shadow that flees at the approach of Truth.[3] Bronze and silver are the two Testaments, for "silver has a ring to it and gives out light, bronze has a ring to it and does not give

out light."[4] For some, a liturgical detail will bear the weight of a similar teaching: at a pontifical Mass, if two candles are lit at the reading of the Gospel, this is in order to signify that the Law and prophecy bear witness to it, and if they are extinguished once the reading is over, it is because, once the Gospel is promulgated, neither the Law nor prophecy has a purpose any longer, and so both the Law and prophecy disappear.[5]

But most of the symbols work in an opposite way and put their stock in the second phase, wherein the two Testaments come together to make only one, since the Old Testament undergoes a conversion and exaltation in the New Testament. They show how "the departure of the shadows" is the same thing as "the illumination of the night."

The Gospel provides a certain number of these symbols. The loaves of bread multiplied by the Lord are broken up by the Apostles so that they can be distributed to the crowd, precisely because it is the role of the Apostles to explain Scripture, to break it, so to speak, in order to separate the letter from the spirit; it is their role to open it, in order to extract the marrow that must nourish the understanding of the faithful.[6] The Good Samaritan's two denarii both carry an effigy of the eternal King, since Christ is the end term of the Law.[7] Jesus' saying about the two women milling grain, of whom one will be taken and the other left on the Day of the Lord, was first applied to the Church and Synagogue. The Church and the Synagogue each took a different interpretation from Scripture, one fertile and the other sterile.[8] But one cannot rest content with this: are not two stones needed to mill? These two millstones are the two Testaments. The first serves no purpose as long as the second does not come to be superimposed on it. In the end, pure flour results from the millstone that has been set up in this way. A homily by Saint Maximus of Turin[9] develops the comparison with a wealth of ingenious details, which would not be forgotten afterward.[10] More important and better founded, moreover, in the intentions of Scripture itself are the two great symbols of the Transfiguration and the miracle at Cana. Both of these are developed by Origen. On the mountain Christ is shown being assisted by Moses and Elijah: it is always the Old Testament that bears witness to the New. Moses and Elijah are clothed in white, as is Jesus. It is the glory of the New Testament that is reflected onto the Old Testament. But when the three privileged spectators lift their eyes again, they see nothing but Jesus: the New Testament has come to absorb the Old.[11] Furthermore, there is no longer any need for a tent, since "the Law and the Prophets are summarized in the Gospel."[12] Saint Jerome borrowed this beautiful symbol from Origen.[13] It can be found again in Saint Augustine[14] and his successors in the Latin tradition, notably Ambrose Autpert, who lingers attentively on

the three apostles, but who is no less apt to talk about the essential aspect: "the harmony that has been achieved between the Old and New Testaments."[15] It is also to be found in Paschasius Radbertus, who sees the luminous cloud as the Holy Spirit covering with his shadow "those who were one with Christ in the Gospel."[16] Better still, the symbol is to be found explicated in Hervé du Bourg-Dieu, in a homily that was long attributed to Saint Anselm.

> . . . Lifting their eyes, they saw nobody, except Jesus all alone — which is to say, the New Testament.
>
> The cloud has been lifted, and as Moses and Elijah disappear, Christ is the only one that can be perceived. Because the shadow of the law and the prophets has departed, the true light shines forth in the blazing beauty of the Gospel. For when the shadow of the law and prophecy, which covered the minds of men with its veil, recedes, both can be found in the Gospel. For although there were three of them, they have become one. At the beginning there were three of them that could be seen. In the end there is one. Because the law, prophecy, and the Gospel seem to be three entities, when they are perceived superficially according to the letter. On the other hand, when they are regarded according to an interior sense, they show themselves to be one. For the law and prophecy, when they are understood spiritually, are none other than the teaching of the Gospel.[17]

As for the miracle at Cana, its symbolism is as rich as it is simple. Jesus changes the water of the letter into the wine of the spirit.[18] Heir to the ancient law, he transforms it into the gracious beauty of the Gospel.[19] "By his power he changes the water of the law into the wine of the Gospel."[20] At the same time, by the same operation of his omnipotence, he changes the hearts of those whom he calls to newness of life in a newness of understanding,[21] and already he is transforming their mortal condition by infusing into them the seeds of a glorious resurrection.[22] Of all the symbols furnished by the Gospel, this is the one most often referred to in exegetical writings and in the liturgy. It allows the historical preparation for the coming of Christ to be taken quite amply into account. Similarly, although in a weaker respect, it can also refer to each soul's preparation to receive him. In either case, there is no risk of exaggeration. If closer consideration is given to the replacement of ordinary wine, which has run out, with a better wine, then particular prominence is given to the

progress that the New Testament represents over and above the Old Testament, which is perfected by the New: ". . . And the New Law, once it is tasted, supersedes the savor of the old."[23]

If, on the other hand, more attention is paid to the miraculous change of water into wine, we arrive at a better estimation of the utter newness of the work accomplished by Christ,[24] and in accord with the severest canons of criticism, we acknowledge the necessity for the "transfer" that alone allows for the allegorical interpretation of the ancient Scriptures:

> The Word of God became flesh, fulfilled the Old Testament, unlocked the old Scriptures, and changed them into wine, transferring them to the plane of an allegorical and moral understanding.[25]

Saint John's account gave rise to a goodly number of ingenious remarks. There is a sense of wonderment, for example, about the waters of the Gospel: they are better than the wine of prophecy, since they provide the delicious wine at the end of the banquet.[26] There is a lengthy and refined discussion on the stone jars, their number, their capacity, as well as the role of the steward of the feast and that of the servants, in accordance with the classical methods of allegorism.[27] The mystery of Cana is related to the mystery of Bethlehem and that of the Jordan, and the liturgy calls on us to make this link.[28] The mystery of Cana is also related to the Song of Songs, the nuptial framework of which calls on us to make this link.[29] Or going further yet, we can see the mystery of Cana prefigured, right on the first page of Genesis, by the transformation of the primordial fire and the initial diffusion of light into the splendid brilliance of the sun.[30] But, in the final analysis, this whole effort serves only as a bid to translate, without betraying it or plumbing its depths, the idea that inspired Saint John when he reported the miracle.[31] Is not the Jesus who changes the water into wine in the course of the wedding banquet[32] the incarnate Word, who has come to invite humanity to the divine espousals, who, by the effect of his death and resurrection, changes the letter into spirit, weakness into strength, and man into God?[33] "The literal sense of these Scriptures," says Rupert, "is changed, just as water is changed to wine, even while the sons and daughters of the marriage are given a toast by means of the spiritual understanding."[34] This is the idea that is recapitulated, for example, in a sermon by Ivo of Chartres (?):

> The water that has been changed into wine at the wedding gives us the mystic message that when God took on a human nature and

> two, namely, Christ and the Church, became one flesh, then the Law, which up till then had been carnally observed, was understood spiritually through the dispensation of Christ's humanity. We too are transferred from the insipid, future life of the old man to adoption as the sons of God through this union between Christ and the Church.[35]

The symbols borrowed from the books of the Old Testament are more numerous. The two cherubim of the ark of the covenant, those "cherubim of glory" alluded to by the Letter to the Hebrews,[36] represent one such magnificent example. It was natural to compare them with the two seraphim in the vision of Isaiah 6:2. This connection, which was destined to become classic, had, however, been preceded by another. Saint Jerome gives us some information on this subject. According to him, Origen had had the unhappy notion, indeed, the "impious" notion, of considering the two seraphim the Son and the Spirit, covering the invisible Father.[37] Origen gave a similar interpretation, Jerome could have said, of the two cherubim of the Tabernacle and the "two living ones" of the Song of Habakkuk.[38] Let us observe merely that his exegesis did not at all have the "impious" and "blasphemous" character that Jerome and the author of the treatise *In Isaiam 6,1-7* attribute to him in a later polemic outburst. Furthermore, we should note that the assimilation of the Word and the Spirit (Wisdom) to the cherubim and seraphim, which came from Judeo-Christian sources, was already to be found in the work of Saint Irenaeus.[39] "I have changed," Jerome continues, "that odious explication that he proffers in his treatment of the two Testaments."[40] In fact, even before his time, "some of the Latins," he himself tells us elsewhere,[41] had proposed this new way of understanding. This new way was destined to triumph. Saint Gregory adopts it and thus influences the whole Latin tradition regarding the two golden cherubim with spread wings, who faced each other within the Dwelling Place of Yahweh at the two ends of the mercy seat, their gaze turned toward him. Does "cherubim" not mean "fullness of knowledge"? Do not the two Testaments in some respect frame the Mediator, since one of them prophesies what the other shows as having been fulfilled? The pure gold of the cherubim is the pure truth of the two Testaments. Their spread wings are the protection against error and sin that we find in Scripture when we ask it appropriate questions. They touch the two opposite walls of the Tabernacle, inasmuch as one of the two Testaments is given to the Jews and the other finds a welcome with the Gentiles. As the two cherubim and the seraphim are inseparable, the two Testaments "ever continue on together, preaching and teaching together," and if we open up the city of our heart

to them, they make common cause in preparing for the coming of the Lord to it.[42] But the most significant feature is that they look at one another, "because the two Testaments do not disagree with one another in anything,"[43] "because the Testaments are harmonious in bearing witness to the Lord in the same measure,"[44] and "because they perceive things the same way, they speak in harmony."[45] This mutual gaze "signifies the friendly and harmonious relations between the two Testaments"[46] in Christ: "because all of Sacred Scripture, the Old Testament no less than the New, looks to Christ alone."[47] In his commentary on the Fourth Gospel, Rupert sees in this connection the intimate union of the two Johns, the Apostle and the Baptist, "the great trumpets of the two Testaments: one of the Johns being the most distinguished of the evangelists, and the other John the greatest of the prophets."[48] Coming back to Isaiah's seraphim (which he calls cherubim elsewhere), Stephen Langton observes that they "proclaim the praises of God to one another," just like the two Testaments, which proclaim the same truth, "each one of which contains the other."[49]

Elsewhere in the book of Exodus, the waters of Marah, which Moses made sweet by throwing into them a tree that Yahweh had shown him,[50] lend themselves to signifying the ancient books of Scripture. Understood carnally, these ancient books are bitter, with a bitterness that is deadly today, and the soul cannot quench its thirst with them. Through the spiritual sense that is communicated to the books by the wood of the cross, they become the very sweetness of the Gospel: "let the bitterness of the law be overcome by the sweetness of the cross."[51] From the time of Tertullian[52] and Origen[53] onward, this image, which is so simple and yet so striking, is reproduced indefinitely.[54] The waters of Marah that have become sweet are to be compared with the sterile, deadly waters that Elisha changes into living waters.[55] Again, the waters of Marah are a counterpart to the water at Cana that has been changed into wine.

What about the symbols of the same great fact that are to be found in the Psalms! Just as "deep calls to deep," the two Testaments call each other, and the more they are understood in their depths, the more they merit the name of "deep" and the more pronounced is their act of summoning.[56]

> O how this deep that is the Old Testament calls to the deep of the New Testament! O how ancient things harmonize with things that are more recent![57]

Just as "day to day pours forth speech," so is each of the Testaments addressed to the other, and both of them, in this exchange, become equal

sources of light.[58] In Christ they are both day, and as it is Christ who shines on the one and the other, together they comprise only one light.[59] David heard two things. Nonetheless, "God spoke only one time"; for if it was very much the case, on man's part, that there were two times in revelation, "the new or the old, according to the circumstances," the deeper an appreciation one attains of these two elements, the ancient and the new, the more one sees them joined together in one reality.[60] Just as the heavens unfold themselves in the firmament like a parchment, so do the heavens of Scripture, making the mysteries that are to be found concealed in it apparent to the eyes of everyone.[61] And just as the breath of the Lord releases the teeming waters, opening up the closed garden and unsealing the blocked up fountain, so does the Spirit that breathes at the coming of the incarnate Word open up the garden of Scripture, causing floods of spiritual understanding to gush forth from its fountains. But up to that point, "the sacramental mysteries of the Church had not yet been made manifest, the spiritual understandings of the Scriptures had not yet flowed forth."[62] Then there is the metaphor of the archer and his bow. When the archer bends his bow to attach the string, the rigidity of the wood or the horn finds itself bent by the tension of the flexible bowstring. Similarly, the divine Archer, who is the Lord, draws tight the bowstring of the New Testament, and thus "the Old Testament is bent away from the rigidity of the letter and is turned toward a spiritual understanding":[63]

> Each of the laws is an archer's bow: an old bow and a new string;
> The tight string bends the bow, and also the rigidity of
> The old law. The new law bends it from history to allegory.[64]

Or else the two Testaments may be construed as the two ends of a bow, and the bowstring, which, as it is stretched, brings them closer to each other, is a sign of their harmony.[65]

Among the other symbols one finds also the two-edged sword in the mouth of the horseman of Revelation,[66] the two breasts of the Bride in the Song of Songs,[67] Jacob's ladder with its two sets of rungs,[68] the animals that chew cud and have a cloven hoof,[69] and the wheel within the wheel of Ezekiel's chariot, which is commented on so memorably by Saint Gregory:[70]

> The Old and New Law are to be understood as a double wheel: The outside wheel is the covering one, while the second, covered wheel, is the wheel that does the uncovering.[71]

We have, also, Jacob's well, "the well of the Living and Seeing One," the well of knowledge of the Scriptures which one is led to by the road of Christ's Passion.[72] So, too, the Psalm's "two ranks of clergy," between whom rests the person who reads the Bible as a Christian. These symbols are understood in a variety of ways but always so as to arrive at the same doctrinal significance.[73] Then there is the scene that has Jacob in the presence of his blind father: "Isaac recognized the garment of the Old Scripture, and then realized that it had been changed."[74] And we have the two stone tablets engraved by the finger of God, that is to say, by his Spirit. And the two mountains of Zechariah, and the two Living Ones of Habakkuk.[75] Also the two doors of Ezekiel's sanctuary that turn in on themselves, "so that in history you may have an understanding of the spirit and in tropology the truth of history."[76] The two wood pieces that make up the cross present the eyes with the "dual figure"[77] of the two Testaments, etc.

Let us survey some other symbols taken from outside the Bible. Among numerical symbols, the number fifteen signifies the harmony between the two Testaments, because it is made up of seven, a number characteristic of the Old Testament, and eight, a number proper to the New Testament.[78] Indivisible numbers typically signify their indivisible union.[79] And then we have a liturgical symbol: the two alphabets that the bishop inscribes on the ground when he consecrates a church do not merely show that Christians receive both Testaments. They represent the twofold science of Scripture or the science of these two Testaments according to the letter and according to the spirit.[80] Cassiodorus explains a natural symbol: just as two eyes together enhance the beauty of each eye and cooperate in the action of seeing, so "the two beautiful volumes of the sacred Testaments are set side by side," "they are one in their outlook, one in their sensibilities."[81] Saint Gregory did not disdain to use a cosmic symbol:

> . . . Wherever Arcturus turns, it shows the Pleiades, which signify the New Testament. This is because the works of the New Testament are proclaimed through all the things that the Old Testament speaks of.[82]

Finally, let us conclude this incomplete list by returning to the Song of Songs: the two Testaments are the two lips of the bride, which reveal the same secret and bestow the same kiss.[83]

Obviously, not all of these symbols are of the same quality. Some are quite artificial. Many of them depend on the "allegorical" method in its

more childish aspect — in the eyes of this writer, at least. But, whatever their character may be and by whatever name they are called, we shall not confuse them with the thing which they are charged with signifying — which is the principle of Scriptural allegory itself. They are only an illustration of it by means of "likenesses," even though some desire to call them "authentic."[84] Nor should we confuse this scriptural allegory, understood in its fullness, with what is nowadays called "typology," a modern name that has enjoyed a good press for some time now.[85] Scriptural allegory gives sanction to typology, it gives it its foundations, it contains it in itself. But if typology were the only aspect to be examined, there would not be any penetration through to the very foundations of traditional doctrine concerning Scripture. Not only does typology,[86] such as it is ordinarily defined, not have its own intrinsic foundations, it says nothing intrinsically about the dialectical opposition between the two Testaments or about the conditions of their unity. Therefore it is quite inadequate to show, in all its power, the work accomplished by Jesus Christ. It provides no thoroughgoing explanation of the New Testament's rootedness in the Old, and, furthermore, it does not explain the emergence of the New Testament and its spirit of sovereign freedom. Giving itself the task of establishing "a correspondence between historical realities at different moments of sacred history," it does not in itself have the wherewithal to show that the New Testament is something other than a second Old Testament, which would still leave us, in the final analysis, within the confines of history.[87] It does not express the link that spiritual understanding has with personal conversion and the life of the Christian,[88] the relationship between the "New Testament" and the "New Man,"[89] between the newness of understanding and spiritual newness.[90] Nor does it concern itself with antithesis or "contrasting parallelism," which were so strongly underlined by the first Christian generations and always maintained by the tradition of the Church.[91] It arrests the spiritual impulse halfway. In its very truth, it remains removed from the great Pauline influence that animates this whole doctrine.

"That which is ancient has passed away, everything has become new! The letter gives way, the Spirit surpasses it; the shadows lift, Truth makes its entry."[92] Here then is the era of the Spirit, which is the era of the vocation of the Gentiles and the mystic espousals.[93] Here is the unique *kairos*, "the day of our newness."[94] It is the era of the great "recapitulation," since it is a time of great hope. For us, the Old Testament itself becomes a new song.[95] Even through these old accounts and these old laws, a new banquet is prepared for us.[96] Filled with a new spirit, which has been poured into

us by the incarnate Word, we have to adore God in a new way.[97] We have to listen to the Spirit of truth, the life-giving Spirit, who pulls us away from the dead letter.[98] Henceforth we ourselves must live "not under the old written code but in the new life of the Spirit."[99] We must accept everything "with the freedom of the Spirit,"[100] which is the freedom of the Gospel.[101] "God is not middling and moderate, nor is he petty and crabbed!"[102] The "spiritual understanding,"[103] Saint Augustine specifies, is "Christian freedom."[104] It is the spiritual understanding that makes the spiritual man, the new man, the free man.[105] Let us, therefore, reject fleshly servitude as we read Scripture, and let us rather embrace the understanding that liberates.[106] And Saint Bernard says: "You leave the fleshly sense and move to an intellectual understanding, from fleshly servitude to the freedom of spiritual understanding."[107] Let us be attentive, says his disciple Isaac of Stella, "to the spiritual freedom in the sacred words."[108] In observations like this there is neither confusion nor extrapolation. These are merely faithful, one could even say literal, commentaries on the texts of Saint Paul, notably in the Second Letter to the Corinthians:

> But when a man turns to the Lord, the veil is removed. Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom.[109]

Christian exegesis is an exegesis in faith. But it does not presuppose the instances of naivety that have sometimes been imputed to it. Taken in its entirety, not in its details, and in its substance, not in its embroideries, it is an act of faith in the great historical Act that has never had and never will have its equal: for the Incarnation is unique. This exegesis is conscious of its development by virtue of a creative principle, or, to be more precise, a transfiguring principle. But it does not itself admit this principle. What it does is merely draw indefinite consequences from it, as it uses the tools that each age offers to it. It defines itself by saying, with Rodulfus Ardens:

> Let ministers of the New Testament read and understand the Sacred Scriptures not according to the meaning that they construe, but according to the meaning by which the Scriptures are construed.[110]

These are profound words, which can possibly be understood in two ways, both equally true. Christian exegesis grows in Jesus Christ, who gives the Scriptures their meaning. It grows in Jesus Christ, who has transformed and renewed everything. In him the ancient texts of Scripture are "converted." Like those who are now its ministers, it is "a new

creature": ". . . and a golden race of people takes its rise throughout the whole world."[111]

5. The Sense Given by the Spirit

Such is the deep meaning of the Christian distinction between letter and spirit. It was established right from the beginning with some definite features by the Apostle Paul, who, in this respect, wanted only to be a witness to Christ, the exegete of his Exegesis. What is more, the distinction is unanimous. Regarding it, there is no duality of traditions such as pertains to classifications and explanations that are less fundamental. Without a doubt the meaning of this distinction is more or less vigorously grasped, more or less clearly analyzed in accordance with the circumstances in question: not all the commentators on Scripture are Origens or Augustines! There is, moreover, no doubt that two family groups of understanding, as it were, can be distinguished. Each of them will prefer to make use of one of the two formulas that divide the triple or fourfold sense between them. We shall return to this subject at a later point. The members of the first of these two family groups are more attentive to the interior principle of the spiritual understanding, which is the Holy Spirit.[1] The members of the second group are especially concerned with its essential Object, which is Christ.[2] More than anything else, the first are spiritual. In Scripture they seek, in a direct way, "an understanding of the spiritual life."[3] The second are above all men of doctrine. In Scripture they seek first and foremost "the spiritual mysteries of Christ."[4] But what is explicit with the one group is found implicitly in the other group, and vice versa. The first have no intention of exhausting the spiritual life by cutting it off from its source any more than the second intend to blaspheme this source by denying or neglecting its spiritual fecundity. They are both well aware that Christ cannot be recognized except through the Spirit, and that this Spirit is always the Spirit of Christ. "The law ought to be understood spiritually in Christ."[5] All of Scripture is evangelical when it is contemplated, as it should be, "in the Spirit of the Lord."[6]

Whether it be to denounce their arbitrariness and archaic character, or, more rarely, to justify them, there is almost always an interest in the methods of ancient exegesis. Its machinery is taken to pieces and its sources are catalogued, but there are no precise questions about the establishment of its methods and what service these methods are meant to

perform. Or else we find that the variety of its content is described without any attempt to find the principle which confers true significance on these thousands of details, the principle which establishes and proportions their objectivity, and which assures that they are linked to each other. For the historian, analyses of this kind are not of middling interest. In the end, however, they appear hollow and trifling, or they can even be seriously deceptive, as long as they are not joined to another endeavor. This indispensable endeavor should aim not at explaining the great synthetic idea that is always present as a backdrop to this exegesis by breaking it up into its constituent parts, but rather it should aspire to understand this idea in its originality, for it is always being met with in the texts. It is a notion that is asserted on many an occasion, and more than once it is expressed with some magnificence.

Once they are explained, it is possible for these matters to appear quite simple, even too simple. In such a case, one is tempted, after having believed from a distance that the ancient exegesis was composed of whimsical oddities, to see its guiding "principle" as being no more than a banal commonplace. The fact is that we live twenty centuries on from this principle. On the other hand, the opposite situation is possible: it can happen that someone who is glad to take a less inexact view of the principle succeeds in "realizing" its pregnant signficance. In that case, instead of participating in the astonishment that has fueled so many speculations on Scripture, a person may be led to pass judgment on their excessive boldness. Perhaps one of the reasons for a judgment like this is that our faith, that faith which these speculations helped to "construct," has subsided somewhat. But let us return to our modest purpose. Let us return to the history that we have undertaken, a simple history of certain words and certain classifications.

"We ought to have a spiritual understanding. After the truth of history, everything should be perceived spiritually."[7] When faced by the unanimity of centuries, a unanimity that abounds with witnesses from the very first generation of Christians right to the time of recent ecclesiastical documents,[8] one has every good reason to be astonished at seeing some contemporary authors not only criticizing certain particular features of a complex theory (certain procedures, applications, and excrescences), but going so far as to reject the naming of a "spiritual sense," to denounce it as equivocal. But then what word in what language cannot lend itself to being equivocal? Furthermore, these same authors speak as if what were at stake here was a matter of mere novelty, a question of terminology arising from a personal choice, indeed, from suspect patterns of thought.

Nevertheless, even of late, there has been no shortage of theologians willing to observe that this phrase was of common usage, "shared and often used by nearly everyone."[9] There has been no shortage of them willing to affirm that the reality of the "spiritual sense," denied though it be by certain anti-Catholic writers, was a question of faith.[10]

A healthy scepticism continues to be warranted, too, when it comes to the strong opinion expressed by some exegetes, who have been led to believe that the progress achieved in their discipline these days renders the traditional distinction void in terms of its very basis in principle. This is because they imagine that a distinction of this kind is due entirely to ignorance of scientific method and they suppose as a result that it can only be justified among the ancient exegetes as a "provisional fill-in." Such an a priori position is not conducive to an understanding of the distinction.

Although the role of scientific method is not to be slighted in any way, the failure nonetheless of the well-intentioned efforts that have been deployed by some in order to absorb the spiritual sense without destroying it could be considered predictable, a foregone conclusion. Thinkers in this school of thought reclaim the spiritual sense in its entirety as a literal sense that is tagged as being "full." They suppose that "if well understood," this "full" literal sense would encompass everything that the ancient tradition asked of the spiritual sense. It would aptly constitute "a scientific demonstration of the ways in which the two Testaments harmonize." This is a noble and generous viewpoint, akin to the viewpoint of certain psychologists — "depth" psychologists — who think that by a method that is still "scientific," but broader, thanks to their "integral psychology," they can rediscover the whole reality of the spirit which the science of classical psychology, operating on the basis of space, has denied or proscribed.[11] Such a point of view captures a measure of reality. The spiritual sense, in its authentic purport, is truly a "full sense." This is the sense that allows us to see how the very prophecies that were realized for the first time in the history of Israel "are fulfilled spiritually more truly and more completely in Christ and his Apostles."[12] This is the sense that gives the Christian who reads Scripture "the fullness that can be sensed in it,"[13] that introduces him "to the fullness of the Gospel,"[14] to that "fullness of the Word" which Saint Gregory distinguishes from a simple "fullness of the book." It is the object not of a dead scientific knowledge, but of a living understanding.[15] It is that "full sense" which is recommended by Benedict XV in his encyclical *Spiritus Paraclitus.*[16] One must take care, however, to guard against a possible confusion of schemes and methods. For it is precisely the case that while an examination of the texts puts a person on

the track of this "fullness," it is not a fullness that is acquired without the Gospel — and we are not speaking of the Gospels consulted as historical documents, but of the Gospel received in faith. This "full sense" presupposes a transposition that is impossible or unseasonable without "newness of spirit." Thus the only "full" sense whose defining framework is entirely coherent does not seem to be quite the same as what a certain number of recent authors have wished to promote.[17] The genuinely full sense "is situated on the level of faith."[18] It is "an essential requirement of faith."[19] It is the sense that is recognized by the Church and in the Church.[20] Furthermore, the spiritual understanding, which is an acknowledgment of it, cannot be a matter of pure technique or pure intellectuality. Whatever supple intellectual factors are brought to bear in determining it, whatever good and reasonable process of change is envisaged in considering the natural approaches that are apt to lead a person to it, the Spirit of Christ cannot be eliminated from it. The spiritual understanding is a gift of this Spirit.[21] "Whoever thinks that he can unlock the mysteries of the Scriptures without the Spirit of God is clearly like someone without light who feels his way in a daze along walls that are strange to him."[22]

This is how the spiritual understanding has always been understood in the Church. This spiritual understanding does not impede the scientific work of the exegete any more than scientific work can replace the spiritual understanding. The "true science" of the Scriptures, in the ancient sense of the word, does not depend entirely on "science," in the precise, modern sense of the word, even though it does benefit from it to a large extent. It is not separable from the "outlook that permits us to recognize Christ."[23] Inasmuch as it has a close connection with faith, it is a connection marked by humility,[24] purity of heart,[25] and perfection of life.[26] What is more, it teaches us about the mystery of the Transfiguration:

> Only those who transcend earthly desires with their understanding perceive the majesty of Holy Scripture, which is fulfilled in the Lord.[27]

In effect, such a knowledge of the Scriptures leads to "eternal life."[28] In its fullness, it becomes identified with the Kingdom of Heaven. It is one of the great models of the science of exegesis, and is not under suspicion of scorning or neglecting human labor, which is an aid in disclosing it: "The Kingdom of Heaven, knowledge of the Scriptures."[29]

Between these two kinds of "science," there are, to be sure, many connections — several works of recent vintage have contributed to a better definition of these connections[30] — but this is not to say that they are

homogeneous. The gap between the two bears a certain comparison to the one that is observable between the theology of the schools and mystical knowledge within the context of faith. Mysticism can no more turn up its nose at theology than the spiritual understanding can disdain the historical meaning established by exegesis. Nevertheless, mysticism is something other than theology, and cannot be considered a natural extension of it. And like mysticism, the spiritual understanding depends on illumination, which can only be given from on high.[31] It is more apt to be received than to be won or found.[32] Human effort has its part in it, as it does in every salutary work, and every age brings its available resources to bear on it, resources that every individual is invited to incorporate in himself, indeed, to perfect according to his means. But an effort of this nature is never directed merely at arriving at a better historical knowledge. In other words, within the perspective of our problem, the human progress of exegesis consists of our being made to reread the texts of the "New Testament" in the ever more illuminating light of the Old. This is a precious fruit, a very necessary method. It is in this respect, perhaps, that we are most obliged to surpass or set to rights ancient exegesis as studied in this work. But what remains after this, by a converse movement of thought, is "to recover" the Old Testament, to reread it in the light of the New Testament such as it is given to us by faith, and thus to lead it "to the sense that is invested in the Gospel."[33] This is a measure that no longer tends only to a better human knowledge, guaranteeing a greater doctrinal security,[34] but to a better spiritual "edification," of both the Church as a whole and of each one of us. In this case, it is no longer a historical document that is being studied, but it is the Word of God that is being received, as it is addressed to us "here and now." In any case, this is the twofold movement that characterizes patristic and medieval exegesis. Now it cannot be that we are able, by perfecting or correcting the first, totally to make up the deficiency of the second. "If you want to understand, you can only do so through the Gospel."[35] "Holy Scripture, which speaks of the mysteries of the kingdom of God to spiritual men, is like a parable to men of this world."[36]

This, along with a great many other things, is explained by John of Salisbury when he compares some professors of his time who are overly proud of their scientific knowledge and are rather unspiritual to boot, to the eunuch of the Queen of Ethiopia:

> In the chariot of the eunuch of the Queen of Ethiopia they discuss and read the Scriptures with eyes closed, and they disdain or are

> unable to see him who "is led like a lamb to the slaughter" (Isaiah 53). . . . In any case, although they are seated on the wheels of Scripture, and are borne by a motion of winged animals, their tongue, when they discuss higher things, licks at the earth, nor do they understand the Scriptures, because the Lord of every kind of knowledge does not open their hearts.[37]

Thus, in the final analysis, it must be said that:

> Scripture does not need human wisdom in order that we might understand what is written, but rather the revelation of the Spirit, so that, discovering the true meaning of the things that are to be found enclosed in it, we may draw abundant profit from it.[38]

Without a doubt, we must do our best, with renewed tools and materials, to imitate the Ancients who studied the Bible "with the sweat of their brow, exercising the subtle genius that is innate in them."[39] It is an illusion "to imagine that it is possible to attain the spiritual meaning of the Old Testament by means of symbolic transpositions, through some sort of puzzle game." But it is no more possible to attain this spiritual sense in its entirety by a scientific knowledge that is purely human, "by definite methods, the methods of religious history," which are suitable "when it is a matter of establishing proofs."[40] Let us not be seduced by scientism, in order to escape illuminism. What is very much needed in the long run is that "the eyes of the interior man"[41] should be opened, for they are susceptible to a light that is different from the light that fills the eyes of the wise and learned. As Richard of Saint Victor says, we must acquire "the eyes of the dove."[42] Saint Jerome observes that: "We cannot arrive at an understanding of Scripture without the assistance of the Holy Spirit, who has inspired it."[43] This is "the spiritual sense, which the Spirit gives to the Church."[44] "When things are revealed by an anointing of the Spirit, the mind undergoes an expansion, which enables it to understand Scripture."[45]

To sum up, science and spirituality are in no wise incompatible. In the normal course of things, they should help and support one another, and it is obviously desirable for them to be joined together in the confines of the same subject area. But it is not divinely decreed that the most learned should necessarily be the most believing or the most spiritual. Nor is it divinely decreed that the century that would see the greatest progress in scientific exegesis would, by virtue of that very fact, be the century that

would best understand Holy Scripture. Thus we need both the learned, in order to help us read Scripture historically, and the spiritual men (who ought to be "men of the Church") in order to help us arrive at a deeper spiritual understanding of it. If the former deliver us from our ignorance, the latter alone have the gift of discernment, which preserves us from interpretations that are dangerous to the faith.[46] Saint Augustine compares spiritual men to the hills toward whose summits the Psalmist lifts his eyes:

> "I have lifted up my eyes to the hills." By hills we understand the Church's great and famous spiritual men. . . . Through them, all of Scripture is dispensed to us. There are prophets, there are evangelists, there are good doctors: that is the direction in which I have lifted up my eyes to the hills, from whence my help will come.[47]

Thus the informed theologian knows beforehand that the whole veil is lifted only for the person who queries the sacred text "with zealous piety."[48] Even while he accepts the progress that has been made by scientific knowledge and he takes care not to perpetuate all the forms by which faith in the divinity of Scripture was once freely expressed, he recognizes unequivocally that the existence of a twofold sense, literal and spiritual, is an ineluctable given of the tradition. It is part of the Christian patrimony.[49] But it is so on the condition, of course, that this duality be understood and accepted as tradition imparts it. Thus designating any sense that is judged "edifying, pious, and religious" as "spiritual," in order to contrast it with a sense that is declared to be "banal and vulgar," should be disallowed.[50] This would be to understand the spiritual sense itself in a banal way. Together with the Fathers, let us reiterate that the spiritual sense is the New Testament itself, with all its fecundity, revealing itself to us "as the fulfillment and transfiguration of the Old." The passage from one sense to the other, like the passage from one Testament to the other, thus expresses "the very movement of our faith" in some way. If we can now reread all of Scripture "and hear Jesus speak to us in it," this is:

> because Jesus himself has been assimilated to it, after having somehow taken on his body of flesh in it. Jesus revealed the whole mysterious sense of Scripture when he surrendered his body on the cross and poured out his Spirit on the world.[51]

Notes

Notes to the Preface

1. Recently a historian said the following about an exegete of the eleventh century: "One cannot easily see what he means to say any more, perhaps, than he himself can." Now the text in question was in itself perfectly clear and rational.

2. *La metamorphose des dieux*, 1 (1957), 372.

3. We find an example of this twofold antimysticism, which takes both an exegetical and spiritual guise, in J. H. Horbius, *Historia origeniana* (Frankfurt, 1670). The author rejects all of Origen's allegorism as being an outgrowth of Platonism and declares, moreover, that his principal heresy consists of his teaching about union with God. He argues that, regarding beatitude, it cannot be conceded that "whoever attains it, becomes one with God, just as the Father and the Son are one," and that it cannot be affirmed that "God will be all in all" (70). It is impossible to find a more frank and outright condemnation of St. John and St. Paul. Thus it is that Catholicism is condemned by way of Origen.

4. "intellectus fidei"

5. P. Agaësse, *D. Sp.*, f. 25 (1958), 158.

6. Cf. Mohler, *L'unité dans l'Eglise*, app. 7.

7. The scholastic thinkers, wrote a priest named Faydit in 1710, "are to the Gospel what the Talmudic scholars are to the books of Moses. Everything they have touched has become soiled. They have choked the roses under a heap of thorns" (*Nouv. remarques sur Virgile et Homère . . .*, 44-5). In France, the classical prejudice came to the rescue. Then came irreligion. The judgment of Voltaire on the two phases of the Middle Ages is well known: "In the thirteenth century there was a transition from savage ignorance to the ignorance of the scholastics" (*Essai sur les moeurs*, ch. 62).

8. Cf. Smalley, 360.

9. "Nouveau témoin du 'conflit des filles de Dieu,'" *RB* 58 (1948), 112-3.

10. Let us say of the religious, Latin Middle Ages what Albert Pauphilet said of the French literature of the Middle Ages: we must cast off "the ignorance and presump-

tions that formerly attended this conjunction of words we know as 'the Middle Ages' " (*Le legs du moyen âge* [1950], 24). Cf. Lucien Febvre, "Moyen âge et Réforme, ou du pouvoir des étiquettes en histoire," *RHPR* 34 (1954), 198-208. What a great number of authors of this period have been described as being a "phenomenon" or an "exception" or an "enigma"! This makes for a whole slough of exceptions. Phenomena that are multiplied lose their strangeness. Enigmas that are multiplied are divested of their dark obscurity.

11. Etienne Gilson has remarked on certain philosophers who are too heedless (or too biased) when it comes to ideas. He says of them that "the most exacting and rigorous knowledge of what men of the Middle Ages wrote is sometimes combined with the most unscrupulous arbitrariness in their judgments about what they thought" (*L'esprit de la philos. méd.*, 2d ed. [1944], 365).

12. Curtius, 138.

13. Fr. Châtillon, citations taken from Curtius, *Europaïsche Literatur und Lateinisches Mittelalter; RMAL*, 8, 174.

14. This is the process which is used legitimately by Father de Ghellinck in *Mouvement* (cf. 3): everything in it converges toward the Master of the Sentences. But the history of a theological movement is not the history of all the Christian thought of an era.

15. Claude Bodard, O.C.R., in *S. Bernard th.*, 24-5.

16. Paul Lejay, "L'heritage de Greg. d'Elvire," *RB* 25 (1908), 443.

17. Pius XII, the encyclical *Divino afflatu*. On the other hand, without seeking "to elaborate a doctrine of the spiritual sense," the encylical affirms its existence one more time. Cf. Jean Levie, *La Bible parole humaine et message de Dieu* (1958), 186.

18. "Saepius mos Ecclesiae mutatus legitur, et secundum tempus variavit stylum suum Spiritus sanctus" (Honorius, *In ps. 103* [PL 194: 632 C]).

19. Beda Rigaux, O.F.M., *Le congres international des sciences bibliques de Louvain* (*La Croix*, 5 Sept. 1958).

20. For a look at the general impact of the progress that has been effected during the past century: J. Levie, *op. cit.*, 1-226.

21. Inasmuch as I hold to this notion of the right and proper place, I find myself agreeing with the judgment of Robert E. McNally, S.J., "The 'tres linguae sacrae' in Early Irish Bible Exegesis" (*Theol. Studies* 19 [1958], 403): "When the whole picture of the Bible exegesis of the early Middle Ages is finally drawn, one will be able to see more clearly the futility of exegesis without philology, and the hopelessness of theology without exegesis."

22. C. Bodard, *loc. cit.*

23. *La vie de la liturgie* (1957), 261-2. Levie (*op. cit.*, 61) quite rightly distinguishes between "the general spirit of ecclesiastical and patristic interpretation" and "the technical details of particular works of exegesis." He adds that in the body of patristic literature the understanding of Scripture "achieved heights and depths which we will never be allowed to abandon" (and which we may have to rediscover at times). "But it is also quite certain that the knowledge that the Fathers possessed of ancient history and geography, of biblical ethnography, and of ancient ways of looking at the historical relationship between facts was no longer able to be cast in the same terms of reference as the recent acquirements of critical exegesis. To change all this was not to change the Christian vision of history as presented by the Fathers and the Doctors of the Church,

but rather it was to adapt its spirit to a new framework." See also pp. 187-8 on the encyclical *Divino afflatu:* "The Pope laments that these "treasures of Christian antiquity should be so little known by a great number of the writers of our times"; his hope is that Catholic exegetes should make an attentive study of these treasure troves and "draw on the almost incommensurable riches that are accumulated in them." In doing so, they could lead the way for present-day interpreters, prompting them to make greater use of these works. "In this way, at long last, there will take place a happy and fruitful fusion of the doctrine of the ancients, whose words bear a special anointing, with the wider erudition and improved skills possessed by the moderns."

24. *Histoire de l'Eglise,* introduction (French translation by M. Lefevre, 1956), 8.

25. I have borrowed these two expressions from Maurice de Gandillac, in *Philosophie, religion* (1957), 19-20.

26. Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Dieu et l'homme d'aujourd'hui* (French translation by R. Givord, 1958), 34.

Notes to the Introduction

1. "Littera gesta docet, quid credas allegoria,
   Moralis quid agas, quo tendas anagogia."

2. *In Gal.,* 4, 3 (Bible de Douai, 6, Anvers [1634], p. 506).

3. "Therefore, according to the first meaning, which is through the utterance of the words themselves, the literal or historical sense is perceived; according, however, to another meaning, which is through matters as they stand in themselves, the mystical or spiritual sense is perceived, and this sense is in general threefold; because if the matter signified by the words themselves refers to the significance of what the new law enjoins us to believe, then the allegorical sense is perceived; if, moreover, the words themselves refer to the significance of how we are to act, this is the moral or tropological sense; if, however, the words refer to the significance of what is to be hoped for in the way of future blessedness, this is the anagogical sense . . ." (PL 113: 28 CD).

4. This is the opinion still of R. Loewe, "The Jewish Midrashim and Patristic and Scholastic Exegesis of the Bible," *St. patr.* 1 (1957), 504.

5. Hermannus Goldhazen, S.J., *Introductio in sacram Scripturam* (1765), 149.

6. *La Bible au XVIe siècle* (1879), 26-7: "Since the *Catholicon,* our theologians have been mimicking the four verses, even as they distort them by committing new violations of quantity. . . ." In his *Leçons d'introduction générale aux divines Ecritures* (1908), Chauvin inadvertently writes that Saint Thomas explains these two verses in *Quodl.* 7 (446). Balbi's *Catholicon* must have been published as early as 1460; republished in 1506: "The Catholicon, or universal vocabulary and grammatical summa."

7. "I have brought together into one handbook a brief collection of the common things that are more necessary for the simple to know in sacred theology." The *Rotulus* was published in *Angelicum* in 1929 (P. A. Walz, O.P.). Cf. A. Vaccari, S.J., *Verbum Domini* 9 (1929), 212-4.

8. "This science is expounded in four modes according to four senses. . . . What is more, I understand the four senses to be those spoken of in these verses. . . ." Analogous verses summarize the chapters on the soul, the creed, angels, etc. The

Franciscan, Guillaume Le Breton, composed three pieces of verse as a preface to his biblical works; but nothing is said in them about the four senses (A. Wilmart, *Anal. Reginensa*, 18 [1933]).

9. ". . . quid speres anagogia." We find this again in Paul de Burgos's *Additiones* to Nicholas's *Postilla* (1429; PL 113: 38 B).

10. I have not encountered the form given by Goulburn and Symonds (Herbert de Losinga, 2 [1878], 120):

> "The written letter teaches: allegory teaches what you should believe;
> Anagogy what you should hope for; tropology how you should act."

11. "Parum quidem poetici, vulgates tamen sunt versiculi," *Prolegomena biblica* (1704), c. 21, 199.

12. S. Berger, *loc. cit.*

13. "Dicitur historicus quem verba ipsa resignant,
Et allegoricus priscis qui ludit in umbris;
Moralis per quem vivendi norma tenetur,
Quid vero speres anagogicus altius offert."

Summa theologica, 1 (1627), In Primam D. Th. partem, q. 1, "De sacra doctrina," 34-5: "The verses are commonly known, albeit rather rough-hewn. . . . Others emend them so: 'What words disclose in themselves is said to be historical, etc.' "

14. "Ista modis quatuor variatur unda:
Modo transvadabilis, modo fit profunda.
Hinc sapore gratior, dulcis et jocunda,
Nec in altum refluit quo est oriunda.
Planior historia, levis transvadari,
Sed allegoria vix valet enatari,
Sapida moralitas utiliter potari
Anagoge respuit trans immorari."

Fons phil., 5.477-84 (P. Michaud-Quantin [1956], 277).

15. *Tr. de ps.* 1: "in the stream of Scripture . . . That stream has two banks, the Old and the New Testaments, and in both places Christ is the tree that has been planted." Text cited by Benedict XV, enc. *Spiritus Paraclitus*. Apringius, *In Ap.*, c. 22, 2: "The two banks of the river are the two Testaments, where the fullness of our salvation is written . . ." (Vega [1941], 74). Richard of Saint Victor, *In Ap.*, Bk. 3, c. 4 (PL 196: 781 BC); etc.

16. "Qui cum, sicut diximus, sit quadripartitus,
Veteris historia plus informat ritus
Et ob hoc ad alterum magis vertit litus;
Nobis est vicinior modus tripartitus."

V. 541-4 (54). The same image of the river with different branches to portray the division of philosophy is to be found in *Microcosmus*, Bk. 1, c. 66 (Delhaye, 81).

17. "Altus hic est puteus, grandis abyssus inest . . .
Simplex multiplicem cortex hic continet escam:
Littera, seu cortex; sensus ut esca triplex.
Historicum, typicum, moralem discute sensum . . .

Cum legis historiae textum, bibitur quasi dulcor
Lacteus, aut potius simplicis haustus aquae . . .
In typico sensu vini sentitur acumen . . .
Qui bibit hoc vinum Scripturae, saltibus altis
Venatur, reperit, consequiturque Jesum.
Moralem vero cum dat tibi lectio sensum,
Tunc quasi mellitum sugis in ore favum. . . ."

Versus de numero librorum utriusque Test. et modo legendi (PL 212: 43-4; Leyser, *H. poetarum med. aevi,* 741).

18. "Historiam Hebraeis et Graecis fontibus haustam
Hieronymo disces duce.
Allegorias, anagogenque recludent
Origenes, Ambrosius.
Exponent sensus formandis moribus aptos
Chrysostomus, Gregorius.
In dubiis, altaque locus caligine mersis
Aurelius lucem fert.
At brevis et facilis non est spernenda tyroni
Lyrensis expositio."

Bibliotheca sancta, Bk. 3 (Lyon, 1575, 209).

19. "This distribution is not dissimilar to the distribution of individual articles of the creed among individual apostles" ([1535], p. 755). On this allotment among the Twelve Apostles: Guill. Durand, *Rationale,* Bk. 4, c. 25 (1551 edition, f. 80 v.); Sixtus of Siena, Bk. 2 (61). Cf. J. Leclercq, "Sermon sur la Divisio apostolorum attribuable à Gottschalk de Limbourg," *S. Er.* 8 (1956), 222, n. 2 (with references). E. Mâle, *L'art rel. de la fin du m. âge en Fr.* (1931), 247-50.

20. *Ep. dedic. ad Accam:* "I have tried quite diligently to examine what blessed Ambrose, Augustine, and lastly Gregory . . . as well as Jerome, the interpreter of sacred history, and the other fathers perceived in the words of blessed Luke and what they said" (PL 92: 304 D; cf. 134 A).

21. *Ep.* 50, c. 5 (3, 95); this was in order to arrive, it is true, at five leading figures of the monastic state.

22. *In Ex.,* Bk. 1, h. 3, n. 1: "What Matthew, what Luke . . ." (PL 76: 806 B). Cf. O. Rousseau, in *S. Bernard th.,* 303.

23. PL 92: 305-8. On these four living creatures, there is a summary of the traditional symbolism in Sixtus of Siena, Bk. 2 (130-2).

24. *L. de miraculis:* "Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory, who were most learned in both divine and human sciences, and were like the four rivers of Paradise in their eloquence" (P. Hoferer; Bardenhewer, 1, 47).

25. *L. in part. Donati* (Ghellinck, *Mouvement,* 23, n. 2).

26. *S. Eulogii vita,* c. 3, n. 8 (PL 115: 712 B). As early as the litanies of Pseudo-Alcuin (ninth century), the names of the four doctors follow each other (101: 595).

27. Ag., *Adv. Fredeg.,* c. 13: "You do not praise [Scripture] in the way that Augustine or Jerome, Ambrose and Gregory praised it" (PL 104: 167 C). Lothaire to Rabanus (R., *Ep.* 49; MGH, *Ep.,* 5, 504).

28. C. 83: "He used to read blessed Gregory . . . no less than Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome and any of the ancient writers that came into his hands" (PL 137: 282 BC).

29. *De sacra cena:* "also with reference to the authentic writings of Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory" (Vischer, 50).

30. "The sayings of the holy Fathers Gregory, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and those like them, all of whom are the lips and tongue of the Lord" (Bardenh., 48).

31. *Ep. cujusdam adv. laicorum in presbyteros conjugatos contumeliam,* n. 6: "those of venerable renown, Gregory, Ambrose, Jerome, and the masterful Augustine" (*L. de lite,* 2, 441).

32. In Curtius, 569.

33. *Inst.* c. 18-21 (PL 70: 1134-7). *In psalt. praef.,* c. 15: "Father Augustine . . . and the other very learned Fathers, that is to say, Jerome, Ambrose, and Hilary" (20-1).

34. Valence (855); Toul-Savonnières (859) (Mansi, 15, 3 and 537).

35. Visigothic compilation: Origen, Victorinus, Ambrose, Augustine, Fulgentius, and Gregory (Wilmart, *RB,* 29, 59). Rabanus: Augustine, Gregory, and Cyprian (PL 108: 166 B).

36. Paschasius, *In Matt.,* prol.: Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Gregory, Chrysostom, and Bede (PL 120: 35 C).

37. Geoffrey Le Gros, *Vita S. Bern. Tiron.,* prol. n. 1 (PL 172: 1367-8).

38. Cf. n. 35.

39. Peter the Venerable, *C. Petrobrusianos* (PL 189: 730 B). Preface to the Sacramentary of Allan of Farfa (tenth century ms.: Hosp, *Eph. lit.,* 50 [1936], 379). Cf. Arno de Reich, *Apol. c. Folmar:* Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Leo, and Hilary (Weribert, 232-42); but it is chiefly a question of Christology.

40. Aimon, *In Ap.:* "Jerome, Augustine, and rest of the holy Fathers" (PL 117: 1010 D). An anonymous writer from Clairvaux (Pitra, 3, 488).

41. Honorius, *Spec. Eccl.* (PL 172: 1088 A).

42. Council of 745: A certain Clement "objects to the teachings and knowledge of the holy Fathers Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory" (MGH, *Conc.,* 2, 40).

43. *Quaest. in V. T.,* praef., n. 5. Cf. Visigothic Compilation (*RB,* 29, 59).

44. *In Ap.,* 1.10 (656 F). It may be that Autpert desires only to indicate the monastic link that attaches him to Gregory.

45. *De int. div. Script.,* c. 12: "Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine" (PL 131: 1003 B). Similarly Bede (92: 533 C).

46. *In Gen.,* c. 26: "as many wells as were dug by Jerome, Augustine, and Ambrose" (PL 164: 205 B).

47. *De euch. sacr. ad Bereng.:* "Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and many others" (Heurtevent, 219). Ps.-Remi, *In ps. 58* (PL 131: 437 B).

48. Gerhoh complains that in explications of the psalms writers often neglect to cite Gregory (*In ps. 98, L. de lite,* 3, 497).

49. Elipandus, *Ep.* 4, n. 9: "Blessed too is Isidore, the radiant splendor of the Church, star of the West, doctor of Spain" (PL 116: 873 A); n. 2 (870 C). Letter of the Bishops of Spain, c. 2: "Hilary, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Fulgentius, Isidore, Julian, and the rest" (100: 1322 D). In addition, Martin of Leon, *In Ap.:* "Augustine, Gregory, Jerome, Ambrose, Benedict, and Isidore" (209: 328 B).

50. Eighth Council of Toledo (653). They sometimes have a following outside of Spain; "Dial. inter Clunac. et Cisterc" (*M.D.,* 5, 1618 E).

51. *An. cistercien* (Pitra, 3, 487).

52. "Here begins the *Liber Pancrisis*, which means 'The All Golden Book', because in it are contained the opinions or inquiries of the holy Fathers Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, Gregory, Isidore, Bede, and the modern masters . . ." (Ghellinck, 516).

53. *Adv. Bereng.*, c. 1 (PL 150: 408 A).

54. Letter of Matilda of England (†1118): "In these writings of Anselm, to be sure, there is an overflowing abundance of Paul's doctrine, Jerome's conscientiousness, Gregory's great labor, and Augustine's explanations, and what counts for more than all this, the eloquence of the gospel drips sweetly from them" (PL 159: 156).

55. *Liber confort.*, 3: "Read the expository works of the holy Fathers, Jerome, Augustine, Gregory, and the rest of the teachers of virtue" (Talbot, 80).

56. PL 171: 898 A.

57. "Augustine is given first place in works of disputation, Jerome in histories and translations, and Gregory in moral matters" (Landgraf, *Biblica*, 4, 451).

58. And he adds Bede and Remi, ahead of unnamed "moderns" (PL 157: 721).

59. *De gl. et hon. F. hom.*, c. 13: "in the writings of the orthodox Fathers, Ambrose, Hilary, Augustine, and Gregory" (PL 194: 1118 A); however, in a longer list to be found in *In ps. 98*, he welcomes Jerome (*L. de lite*, 3, 497). As early as c. 5 of the *V. S. Columbani* of Jonas Bobiensis: "Hilary, Ambrose, and Augustine, pillars of the churches"; further on, Jerome is named as the author of a *Life* of Saint Paul the Hermit (87: 1014 A).

60. *Ep.* 287 (ca. 1170); *Epistolae* (J. A. Giles, 2 [1845]), 28.

61. *Miscellanea*, Bk. 4, tit. 13: "Poles of acacia wood (Ex. 25), overlaid with gold and concealed in four golden rings placed at the four corners of the ark, carry the ark itself. The Ark is the Church . . . : the teachers are those who, cleaving to the rings, which is to say the teaching of the gospel, carry the Church to the four corners of the world, just as the poles at the four corners of the Ark . . ." (PL 177: 706-7). See above, n. 24.

62. *In Paral.*, 9, 26 (according to Rabanus): "The four chief doorkeepers are the holy teachers, who keep the faith and use the four gospels to open the door to believers and close it to blasphemers. . . . At all four points of the compass they keep watch over the doors, because throughout the four regions of the world they call peoples to the faith" (PL 113: 644 BC).

63. "Lege et relege, et memoria collige scripta quatuor evangelistarum, *id est*, Hieronymi, Augustini, Ambrosii, Gregorii; ascende hanc quadrigam, quae te ducit in altum, quae tibi monstrabit scientiae summum" (*Ep.* 27, to Ulderic, 364).

64. "Gregorius, vir facundus,
Verbo dulcis, vita mundus,
Hominis vultum habuit.
Ambrosius, *leo* fortis,
Ut Helias, numquam mortis
Metu vitia tacuit.

Hieronymus, *bos* secure
Gradiens, vias Scripturae
Solidissime tenuit.
Super omnes Augustinus
Alta petens, vir divinus,
Vultum *aquilae* meruit."

Misset-Weale, 2, 300. Cf. 455-6, Hymn of Lausanne, on the chariot of Scripture, which is pulled by the four doctors.

65. *Sp. Eccl.*: "all four of them and many others are painters who "have illustriously adorned the house of the Lord with various, marvelous pictures" (PL 172: 813-4); *ibid., De omn. sanctis* (1017 A). On Honorius: R. Banevreiss, O.S.B., "Honorius von Canterbury . . . ," *St. Mitteil. Gesch. Benediktiner-Ordens* 67 (1956), 306-13.

66. *Candela* (prol. M.D., 1, 373; v. 1130).

67. S. 48 (PL 194: 1854 B).

68. *In comm. de evang., s.* 3 (PL 217: 606 D).

69. Alvarus (see above, n. 26).

70. "ut Augustinus disputat diserte, Hieronymus explicat eleganter, Ambrosius loquitur scolastice, Gregorius tractat moraliter"; see above, n. 25.

71. "in dulcedine et suavitate," "in callida et subtilissima argumentatione," "in sententiarum pondere," "in theorica disputatione," Henricus Francigena (ca. 1119-24), cited by Charles H. Haskins, *Studies in Med. Culture* (1929), 179. Cicero is associated with them and held to be superior to them "on account of the brilliance of his discourse and his ability to put words together." See above, n. 54.

72. "Perpenditur et cognoscitur Origenis sermo per sententiarum moralitatem et auctoritatum abundantiam; Augustini, per subtilem inquisitionem; Hieronymi, per historiarum profunditatem Ambrosii, ex eleganti eloquentia et ornatu verborum; Hilarii, ex quodam grammatico genere loquendi; Gregorii, per quandam verborum concinnitatem et clausularum prolixitatem" (Ghellinck, *Mouvement*, 23).

73. "genera dicendi" ("copiosum, breve, siccum, pingue")

74. *Saturn.*, Bk. 5, c. 1 (Fr. Eysenhardt, 248).

75. *Ep.*, 1, 4, 3, *ad Claudianum*, n. 7: "Inasmuch as Pythagoras observes, Socrates distinguishes . . . Jerome builds up . . . Augustine adds to what is built up, Hilary is exalted . . . Rufinus is spare and concise . . . Ambrose is persistent." Sidonius, who was held as a classical model, was very much imitated in the Middle Ages. Cf. Arnold de S. Emm. (MGH, *Scr.*, 4, 546).

76. *De planctu* (PL 210: 464 CD); etc. *Anticl.*, Bk. 2, v. 341-62 (R. Bossuat, 82-3), etc.

77. "Hieronymus historiae, Ambrosius allegoriae, Gregorius tropologiae appropriatius insudarunt" (J. de Ghellinck, "Les catalogues des biblioth. médiév. chez les Chartreux," *Mél. Marcel Viller* [*RAM*, 1949], 292).

78. For a knowledge of the four senses "the Holy Spirit has provided the Church with four doctors, each of whom has, in his labors, given more attention to one of the four senses in particular than has any of the others. This is why the literal sense is appropriated by Jerome, while the tropological sense is attributed to blessed Gregory, the allegorical sense to Ambrose and the anagogical sense to blessed Augustine, who has spoken more than the others on heavenly things and the things that belong to a future age" (Pitra, 3, 438).

79. See above, n. 18.

80. ". . . Exploratos fluminis omnes habet sinus" (*Fons ph.*, v. 665 ff. [58-60]).

81. *De studio div. Scripturae*, c. 48 (*Bibl. sel.*, 1 [Venice, 1603], 93).

82. *Inst. ad Verbi Dei scripti intell.*, tr. 3 (Parma, 1711) 12-13.

83. A. Renaudet, *Préréforme et humanisme* (1916), 55.

84. Cf. Loewe, *loc. cit.*: "The succinctness of which may perhaps excuse its liberties with Latin quantity."

85. Thus, in the fifteenth century, Alphonsus Tostat, *Commentaria in quartam partem Matthaei* (Venetian edition [1615], 84).

86. Cf. *Dict. de Trévoux*, 4 (1740), 1432.

87. When they find that the two verses are cited by Kierkegaard in his Diary (1850), the French translators explain in a note that: "It may be that this distich is drawn from some manual of Latin rhetoric; without a doubt anagogia is a neuter plural that is inserted here in order to provide a better rhyme. . . ." Kierkegaard, *Journal* = French translation by K. Ferlov and J. J. Gateau, 3 (1955), 384.

88. "That book has the following special feature, namely, the fact that one literal segment contains several senses, etc." (PL 113: 28 C).

89. Loewe, 502: "The Church faced with the task of expounding the relevance of the scriptural passage for all facets of this conviction as to its own nature, task, and destiny, evolved a fourfold division of biblical exegesis. . . ."

90. *Op. latina* (Witemberg, 3).

91. "figmentum scolasticorum de quadruplici sensu Scripturae," *Disp. de verbo Dei*, c. 277 (Turre, J., 3, 14).

92. *De tradit. hermeneutica* (1786), 14: "What is more, lest anyone imagine that it was only Irenaeus who maintained this absurd way of dealing with the sacred books, come then, let us prove, in a few words, that this mode of interpreting them was common to all the Fathers of those earlier centuries. Thus, even as early as the second century, in the writings of the teachers of that time, those who are learned detect clear and explicit traces of these four senses of Sacred Scripture, which consist of the literal, the allegorical, the tropological, and anagogical (Moshemii, *De rebus christianorum ante Constantinum M. Comm.*, 298 ff). Once they conceded this ruling pattern of the four senses, the good Fathers were able, with little trouble, to extract whatever they wanted from the books of divine scripture."

93. Fr. Tolet, *In Summam theol. S. Th. Aq. enarratio*, vol. 1, *In Primam* (Rome, 1869), 53-4; on q. 1, a. 10: "First conclusion: Sacred Scripture contains in the compass of one literal section of it both a literal and a spiritual sense. . . . Second conclusion: the spiritual sense can also be threefold. . . ." "About the first conclusion . . . I claim that it falls under the defining rubric of faith. . . . Regarding the second . . . I claim that it must be held by faith that there are several spiritual senses in Scripture. It is proven etc."

94. *Herméneutique*, in Lichtenberger, *Encycl. des sc. fel.*, 6, 212. More objectively Chauvin, *op. cit.*, 446: the scholastics have "engraved this adage."

95. "Le réalisme et le symbolisme de Dante," *RB* 66 (1937), 503.

96. *Dante le théologien* (1935), 177; with, it is true, an unexpected reference to an article by Karl Rahner on the beginnings of a doctrine of the five spiritual senses (sight, hearing, etc.) in Origen.

97. "Theologus Dantes," *Bulletin de Jubilé* 5 (1922), 477: "This last process [of exegesis through the four senses] gained a special currency among ecclesiastical writers in the wake of the teaching of Saint Jerome and Saint Augustine on this subject."

98. *Dante le théologien*, 178, 180, 184.

99. *De insp. Sacrae Scripturae* (1906), 140: "Under the heading of the senses of Scripture, there are things that go beyond the true sense of Scripture. These include figurative sayings, artificial deductions, pure inventions, and other things that do not constitute the multiple senses of Scripture, but are partly moral and ascetic applications, partly divisions according to subject, and partly even intellectual follies. There is,

however, no doubt but that many of those writers supposed that in reality various senses which are scarcely mutually coherent underlie nearly every single word of Scripture. Later, however, Scholastics, such as St. Thomas and others, redirected these astonishing inventions back to sacred doctrine."

100. *Origène,* xviii.

101. *L'essor,* 1, 100; 158: "Even in the work of the future Innocent III, with his sure and confident outlook, moral allegorism is intermingled with real description" (with regard to his *De sacro alt. myst.*). *Mouvement,* 13: in the Middle Ages "with the aid of patristic texts that have had violence done to them," (?) "extreme efflorescence of allegorism."

102. "Les principes de la typologie biblique," *ETL* 3 (1926), 310: "The first hemistich is inexact: the literal sense does not always contain historical realities. The second hemistich is not worth much more: the doctrine that needs to be believed is not always intermingled with allegory. Quite often it is proposed directly by the literal sense, as are also the rules of our conduct and our last end." A chapter in the second part of my work will return to this question.

103. Pars 2, sect. 1, c. 3 (Turin [1865], 101-2).

104. An expression used by Dom Olivier Rousseau, *Vie sp.* (April 1952), 378.

105. M. D. Chenu, "Théol. symbolique et exégèse scolastique aux XII-XIIIe s.," *Mél. J. de Ghellinck* (1951), 509.

106. *Esquisse,* 102.

107. *RSPT* 31 (1947), 46: "This enumeration has practical merits; other [senses] could be conceived for it."

108. Vol. 1 (1957), sect. 3, 169-213.

109. *Al-Hallaj martyr mystique de l'Islam* (1922), 704.

110. ". . . furthermore, the literal sense itself truly sets its seal on the other senses, either in order to illustrate dogmas or to commend rules of life."

111. Pius XII, enc. *Afflante divino.*

112. *Mél. M. Viller,* 194-5.

113. "There are four rules for Scripture etc." (PL 156: 25 D).

114. "Therefore, every one of these four modes can occur. Certainly, they can occur individually. If any one of them, though, is considered more useful in caring for the interior man, it is morality, which seems to be more suitable and intelligible in such dealings. Indeed, when we investigate allegory in the prophetic and apostolic books, we find that it builds up almost nothing except faith. . . . To be sure, faith has, by the grace of God, already revealed itself in the hearts of everyone. If it has fairly often been found necessary for faith to be reaffirmed in those who hear it and consider it, it has been found to be no less appropriate to speak even that much more frequently about the things that could firmly build up their morals. For we find it easier and less troublesome to enter into discussion about the nature of the virtues than to examine the sacraments, especially when talk about some of these sacraments must of necessity be quite restrained. For it is quite true that error can be engendered in the less intelligent by preaching that is too lofty. A useful discernment is most likely to be acquired from a moral education. Thus, although the allegorical sense is very likely to be pleasing, if it is added to a sermon at times . . . let there nonetheless be total vigilance over our speech when we deal with the emotions of the interior man etc." (PL 156: 25-6).

115. "There are clearly certain chapters of the gospels that are only treated by the

Fathers allegorically, and these are ones that deal with the person of the Jews and gentiles. If, however, someone discerning and partial to Scripture should wish to examine these passages in the light of other interpretations, there is never or scarcely ever a failure to understand any part of them" (PL 156: 29 AB).

116. It is "the seventh mode." In Ph. M. Charland, O.P., *Artes praedicandi: Contribution à l'histoire de la rhétorique au moyen âge* (1936), 294. These kinds of works, which first saw the light of day in the second half of the twelfth century, bear a very scholastic stamp.

117. H. Caplan, "The four senses of scriptural interpretation and the mediaeval theory of preaching," *Speculum* 4 (1929).

118. *Ars concionandi*, n. 46: "There are four modes of exposition" (Quar., 9, 19-20).

119. Thus *In Epiph. s.*, 3, c. 3, on Luke 15, 8: "Because, therefore, the rational soul has lost that tenth silver coin, namely, the coin of divine knowledge and contemplation, it seeks this coin, sometimes historically, sometimes allegorically, sometimes tropologically, and sometimes anagogically, until it is found" (Q. 9, 159).

120. M. M. Lebreton, "Recherches sur les principaux thèmes théol. traités dans les sermons du XIIe s.," *RTAM* 23 (1956), 6-7.

121. "modus exponendi sacram Scripturam."

122. "modus traditionis sacrae Scripturae."

123. D.U.B. (Berlière), *RB* 9 (1892), 195.

124. Hugh, *Didasc.*, Bk. 6, c. 2: "The person who reads divine things should carefully examine this order that is being sought among the disciplines of history, allegory, and tropology . . ." (PL 176: 799 B).

125. Richard, *In ps. 118:* "Unless I am mistaken, the whole fabric of divine reality is interwoven with these ideas; the whole doctrine of man and the angels is dealt with through these ideas" (PL 196: 332 A). In the thirteenth century, the triple Mirror of Vincent of Beauvais, that is to say, the natural, doctrinal, and historical mirrors, would soon become "the threefold Mirror that is historical, allegorical, and moral"; this is already the case in Henri de Gand (*HLF*, 18, 475): which goes to show how indispensable this division of the senses was.

126. *La renaissance du XIIe s., les écoles et l'enseignement* (1933), 223.

127. P. 99: "These diverse senses are not merely classifications for the interpretation of the text, but distinct disciplines that have their particular methods and constitute, as it were, a pedagogy of scriptural teaching," which, I should add, means theological teaching.

128. M. D. Chenu, *Théologie symb. et exégèse scolast., loc. cit.*, 511 (*Théol. au XIIe siècle*, 197); 517: Hugh makes history, allegory, and tropology three distinct and coordinated disciplines, thanks to which sacred "doctrine" would be built up.

129. Several of the judgments that have been expressed or supposed in this first part of my work will find — or it is my hope, at least, that this is how things will turn out — a more complete justification in the second part.

Notes to Chapter One
§1. Discipline

1. *Sent.*, Bk. 1, c. 19 (PL 83: 581-6); Tyc., *L. De regulis* (18, 15-66); Aug., *De doctr. chr.*, 1. 30-7 (Combès-Farges, 394-422).

2. Sedul. Scot., *In Gal.* (PL 103: 190 A): "regulam intelligendi allegoricas rationes."

3. Jerome, *Q. hebr. in Gen.*: "according to the laws of allegory" (PL 23: 980 A); "The prudent reader should be enjoined not to want to seek the same ordering principle for tropology as for history"; *Ep.* 74, c. 6: "Let all this be said under the cloud-filled sky of allegory. For the rest, you know best, in your prudence, that the rules that obtain in the shadowy world of tropology are not the same as those that hold sway in the truth-filled regions of history" (IV, 31).

4. "leges historiae"

5. "allegoriae consequentia"

6. "rationes anagogicae." Cf. Aldhelm, *De virgin.*, c. 15: "Using the rule of allegory you probe into things, and by drawing on the mystical explanations of the Fathers you conduct your research through a tropological investigation according to types" (MGH, *A. ant.*, 15: 244-5). Bede, *In Sam.* (PL 91: 522 B); Rabanus (109: 345 B, 758 A; 110: 1069 A); Angelome (115: 488 D); J. Scot, *In Jo.*, fr. 2 (122: 331 B); *Sup. Hier. cael.* 1: 2 (153 C); Richard (?), *In Joel.* (175: 334 C); etc.

7. Or., *Sel. in Thren.* : "according to the laws of anagogy" (PG 13: 620 B); Jerome, *In Nahum* : "the laws of allegory" (PL 25: 1262 B), etc.

8. *In Is.*, Bk. 5 (PL 24: 179 B).

9. *In Is.*, Bk. 5, prol. : "he roams the great open spaces of allegory" (PL 24: 154 C); *In Dan.* 9: "allegory, which enjoys an atmosphere of free and open debate" (25: 549 B); Peter Comestor: "with what a free rein allegory roams through the wide, open spaces" (Smalley, 258).

10. Jerome, *In Is.*: "As far as these matters are concerned, I know that I have surveyed the subject of tropology, which covers a great deal of ground and is very hard to disentangle"; Jerome goes on to explain it without otherwise criticizing it (24: 113 C); *In Jonam* (P. Antin, SC, 43, 63).

11. "his tantum legibus circumscripta, ut pietatem sequatur in intelligentiae sermonisque contextu." Cf. *De legibus*, c. 17: "let it not be aggressive in coupling together things which are quite mutually contradictory" (*Op. omnia* [1674], 1, 40, 1); Jerome, *In Abd.* 1, 6 (PL 25: 281-2).

12. "historia, stricta; tropologia, libera." Cf. Jerome, *In Abd.*, 1, 6 *(ibid.)*; *In Is.*: "tropology can be free-wheeling, provided it acknowledges the need for piety" (26: 135 D).

13. Jerome, *In Is.* (24: 259 C); *In Amos* (25: 1018 C); *In Hab.* (1281-2); Bede (92: 151 D); Aelred, *S. ined.*, 2: "according to the laws of tropology" (Talbot).

14. "tropologice, id est, juxta moralis intelligentiae regulas," *In Sam.* (PL 91: 564 A).

15. "haec libertas debet habere modum progrediendi," *Ep. de quat. temp.* (PL 160: 823 C).

16. Jerome, *In Is.*: "it is not that we condemn tropology, but it is because spiritual interpretation ought to follow the guiding order of history; seeing that many people who are mired in ignorance wander in frantic error through the pages of Scripture"

(PL 24: 158-9); "it is a pious wishfulness on the part of the interpreters, and not something that preserves the guiding order of history" (176 A).

17. G. de Nogent, *L. quo ordine* (PL 156: 29 BC).

18. "per omne Scripturarum corpus instabilis vagusque jactatur"

19. "palpator tantummodo spiritualium sensuum ac degustator"

20. *Coll.* 10, c. 13 (E. Pichery, SC, 54: 95). Abbot Isaac indicates the method that needs to be followed: "We discovered that the method that we believed was abbreviated and easy turned out to be more difficult. It was harder to make adequate observations with it than with that process of study that we were previously accustomed to. The previous method allowed us to go through the whole body of Scripture without any fettering tediousness and to indulge in various, indiscriminate thoughts" (95-6).

21. We find that, as early as Keble, there was a protest registered against attributing such a practice to the ancients: 39-40.

22. Rabanus, *In Jos.*, Bk. 3, c. 8: "He did a good job of preserving the distinctive characteristics ('proprietatem') of the spiritual understanding" (following Origen; PL 108: 1082 B). "Propriété," the French term that de Lubac uses here, which is cognate with Rabanus's "proprietas," has no precise English equivalent.

23. "ordo divinae dispensationis"

24. Hilary, *In ps. 67* (Zingerle, 300). Rabanus, *In Jos.*, Bk. 3, c. 12: "to observe the order of the mysteries" (PL 108: 1094 C).

25. *Proth.*: "There are four ruling principles of Sacred Scripture, that is to say, history etc." (PL 113: 63 B).

26. Guibert, *L. quo ordine* (PL 156: 29 B).

27. "ad divinarum Scripturarum lectionem erudiendus accedit," *De sacram.*, Bk. 1, P. 1, c. 1 (PL 176: 163 A).

28. "prima eruditio"

29. "secunda eruditio"

30. Bk. 1, prol.: "That is why he ends up changing his selection of reading. Therefore, seeing that I had previously written a comprehensive volume that deals with the first instruction on sacred eloquence, which depends on an historical reading, I have now prepared, for those who are to be introduced to such a program of study, this second volume on the second instruction, which rests on allegory, etc." (176: 183-4).

31. *Science et sagesse chez Hugues de SV* (1957), 97-8.

32. "moralis eruditio." Cf. P. Comestor, s. 31, commenting on the phrase: "the glory of a father is an educated son" (PL 198: 1792 C).

33. "institutio morum." Cf. *Didasc.*, Bk. 5, c. 6: "education in morals is more oriented to tropology; all of Divine Scripture refers to this end" (PL 176: 794 B); Bk. 1, c. 1: "moral correction . . . and an outline for living" (741 C).

34. *Did.*, Bk. 3, c. 13: "Knowledge that is stained by a shameless life is not worthy of praise, and for this reason the person who seeks after knowledge must be very much on his guard not to neglect discipline" (7773 C).

35. For the theoretical meaning of "disciplina": H. I. Marrou, " 'Doctrina' et 'disciplina' dans la langue des Pères de l'Egl." (*Bulletin du Cange* 10 [1934], 5-25); "L'idée de culture et le vocabulaire" (*S. Aug. et la fin de la cult. ant.* [1948], 549-60); M. D. Chenu, "Disciplina" (*RSPT* 25 [1936], 686-92); *Introd. à l'ét. de S. Thomas d'Aquin* (1951), 107, 258. Cf. Cassiodorus, *De art. et disciplinis*, c. 3 (difference between arts and disciplines

according to Plato and Aristotle); *In ps. 48:* "contemplative and moral discipline" (PL 70: 1203 B, 347 D). For the practical meaning: Leclercq, *D. Sp.*, f. 22, 3, 1291-1302.

36. Osty. Cf. Hebrews 12:5-8, 11 (παιδεία [= *paideia*]). Walter Durig, "Disciplina, eine Studie z. Bedentungsumfang des Wortes in der Sprech der Liturgie und der Väter" (*S. Er.*, 4 [1952], 245-79). It is excessive to say, with Hal Koch or M. Harl (*Or. et la fonction rév. du Verbe incarné* [1958], 109), that Origen or anybody else "owed the notion of education to Greek thought,"

37. "Liber disciplinae"

38. "adhuc indisciplinatis condignam tradens legem," Bk. 4, c. 9, n. 1 (PG 7: 996 B).

39. PL 14: 365 C, 346 BC; cf. 321 B, 365 B. Even the "liberales disciplinae" [= "liberal disciplines"] are bent by Lactantius so that they have a sense of preparation for virtue: *Div. inst.*, Bk. I, c. 21 (S. Brandt, 79); Aelred: "disciplina ordinis" [= "the discipline of order"] (A. Hallier, 122-4).

40. "ordo disciplinae"

41. *Mor.*, Bk. 21, c. 8, n. 13 (PL 76: 197 C). *In Ex.*, Bk. 2, h. 9, n. 18: "custodia disciplinae" [= "keeping watch over discipline"] (1054 B); etc.

42. "disciplinae regula," "disciplinae magisterium," "disciplina custodiae interioris"

43. "disciplina vivendi," "plenitudo disciplinae"

44. "disciplinate," *Coll.* 10, c. 13 (SC, 54, 94). Cf. Or., *In Matt.* 17, 24.

45. "disciplina vivendi," PL 145: 799 D.

46. "spiritualis observantiae disciplina"

47. Pierre Bérenger, *Ep. c. Carthus.* (PL 178: 1978 B). Petrus Cellensis, *De disc. claustr.*, c. 8: "Therefore philosophers have established their own discipline, as have Jews and Christians. Eremitical and cloistered religious have also established their own system of discipline to quite an extent. A diversity of intentions makes for a distinct variety of disciplines" (202: 1113 C).

48. Guerric (PL 185: 101 B). Peter the Venerable on Abelard's taking refuge in Cluny: "He crossed over to the true philosophy of Christ" (189: 1023 A).

49. *De bono disciplinae*

50. PL 40: 1218-22.

51. "De disciplina christiana," c. 1, n. 1 (PL 40: 669). Gerhoh: "the profession of Christian discipline" (*Op. in.*, 1, 242); Leo, *s.*, 63, c. 5 (54: 356 A); Alvarus (121: 526 D).

52. "disciplina Dei," Augustine, *In ps. 124*, n. 10 (CCL 40: 1843); Origen, *In Jer.*: "divine discipline" (PL 25: 661 B).

53. "disciplina Christi," Paschasius (PL 120: 34 A, 1172 C); John of Salisbury (199: 692 B); Martin of Léon (209: 108 C); Isidore: "discipline received from Christ" (82: 296 C); Hélinand (212: 584 D). "A lighter discipline," says Augustine, who compares it to the Law (*In ps. 105*, n. 29; CCL 40: 1563).

54. "disciplina Domini," "disciplina dominica," in Hervaeus, *In I Cor.* (PL 181: 820 A).

55. "disciplina religionis," in Agobard, *De corr. antiph.*, c. 18: "purity of faith and discipline of religion" (PL 104: 337 D).

56. "disciplina christianitatis," in Gerhoh (PL 194: 377 A); "the purity of Christian discipline" (379 B).

57. "disciplina Ecclesiae," in Sulp. Severus, *Dial.* 1, c. 7 (C. Halm, 159); Ans. of Hav.

(188: 1152 B); Martin of Léon (209: 1088); Hélinand, *s.* 12, citing Cyprian (212: 585 AB); Hervaeus, *In Is.*: "the disciplines of the Church, which are fortifications" (181: 556 C).

58. "disciplina legis divinae," in Bede (PL 91: 940 A); Rupert (167: 1101 D).

59. "religiosa sectae nostrae disciplina," Bk. 3 (PL 4: 723 B).

60. *To John of Jerusalem*, c. 5 (PL 21: 630 A).

61. "disciplina catholica," *Ad div. ep.*, 42 (MGH, *A. ant.*, 6, 70); Paschasius (PL 120: 994 B).

62. "disciplina salutaris," in Jonas, *De inst. laic.*, Bk. 1, c. 8 (PL 106: 134 B). Cf. Tertullian, *Apol.*, c. 47 (1: 519 B); Origen, *De princ.*, 1, 1, c. 6, n. 2 (81).

63. "caelestis," in Gelasius (leonine sacramentary 18, 20); Sed. Sc. (103: 285); Paschasius (120: 795 A, 1010 A); "to obey heavenly disciplines" (33 A); Arnulf (137: 250 D); P. Damian (144: 400 C); Berenger (160: 989 C); Eadmer (158: 54 D); Bernard (183: 916 C); Richard (196: 514 D); Petrus Cellensis (211: 652-3); Jean du Transt., *De bono pacis*, Bk. 3, c. 41: "the remedy of heavenly discipline" (174); etc.

64. "superna," in Greg., *Mor.*, Bk. 15, c. 41, n. 47: "the rod of discipline from] above" (PL 75: 1104 D). Séquence (Boucheire, *Rev. des langues romanes* 7 [1875, 35).

65. "divina," in Origen, *In Ex.*, h. 2, n. 1 (PG 13: 682 B); *Sel. in Thren.* (623 D); God. of Admont (PL 174: 115 B).

66. "disciplina Patrum," in Martin of Léon (PL 208: 209 C).

67. "evangelica et apostolica disciplina," in African Council, in Hincmar, *De divort. Loth.* (PL 125: 251 D); Gr. d'Elv.: "evangelical discipline" (Wilmart, BLE, 1906, 241); Gerhoh: "the discipline of apostolic observance" (PL 194: 1248 C); "the custom of evangelical discipline" (*Op. in.*, 1, 227).

68. "disciplina regularis," in *Reg. S. Ben.*, Bede (PL 91: 902 B; 94: 719 B); Jonas of Bobbio *V. s. Attalae*, c. 1: "to submit to . . . the restraints of a ruling discipline" (87: 1055 C); Willib., *V. s. Bonif.* c. 2, n. 7 (MGH, *Scr.*, 2, 336); Cuthbert, *V. Bedae*, n. 4 (PL 90: 37 D); Bernon (142: 1106 B); P. Damian (145: 700 D); Abelard, *Ep. 8* (178: 311 B); H. de Marcy (204: 251 C); Garnier de R (205: 640 C); Absalon (211: 146 D); Hélinand (212: 593 D); Odo of Canterbury, *s.* on Saint Benedict (Leclercq, *St. ans.*, 31, 131); Arnulf of Lisieux, *ep.* 2 (J. A. Giles, 81); God. of S.V., *Planctus BMV* (Delhaye, ET, 253).

69. "disciplinae regulares," in *V. s. Roberti*, c. 1, n. 5 (PL 157: 1273 B); Gerhoh, *De nov. h. temp.* c. 19 (*L. de lite*, 3, 301); *V. s. Gerardi* (MGH, *Scr.*, 4, 487).

70. "disciplinae regula," in P. Damian (PL 144: 411 A); Bruno of Segni (Sp. cas., 3, 10); Adam of Pers., *S. in festo s. Ben.* (107); etc.

71. Cf. Cassiodorus, *In ps. 150*, 4: "a timbrel . . . which musicians strike in a measured, disciplined way . . ." (250, 98: 1328). Sentence of Saint Bernard: "O discipline, how composed it renders all a monk's states and habits of mind!" (Leclercq, *COCR*, XIV, 123).

72. "disciplina religiosae conversationis," in Alcuin (PL 101: 1128 A), who follows Isidore (82: 253 B).

73. "disciplina moralitatis," in Ratramnus (PL 121: 1154 C); Abelard (178: 1636 C); John of Salisbury (199: 493 C); Roger (Talbot, *ASOC*, 7, 224); Gerhoh: "by keeping watch over moral discipline" (*Op. in.*, 1, 174).

74. "disciplina morum," in Augustine, *In ps. 8*, n. 2 (CCL, 38: 50); *V. s. Ambr. Autp.*, c. 7 (PL 89: 1272 B); *V. s. Dunstani*, c. 8 (137: 420 C). Origen as cited by Defensor, *Scint.*, 32, 20: "God is praised by morals and discipline" (Rochais, 125).

75. "disciplina virtutum," in Hildegard, *Sciv.*, vol. 2, n. 5 (PL 197: 490 B); Candidus,

V. s. Egil.: "he was learned in every one of the virtuous disciplines" (105: 391 C); Leo, *s. 41*, c. 1 (54: 272 B).

76. "disciplina patientiae," in Ambrose: "In this way, therefore, he was instructed in the discipline of patience and perseverance" (PL 14: 580 C; cf. 602 B).

77. "disciplina temperantiae," "disciplina caritatis," in Julian of Vézelay; Gerhoh (PL 194: 373 B).

78. "disciplina humilitatis," in Hervaeus, *In Rom.*, preface (PL 181: 595 C); Aug., *ep.* 127, n. 5: "the pious discipline of humility" (33: 485).

79. C. 7: "the different degrees of humility or discipline" (H. Koenders, 15). Like other legalistic words, the word is charged with a new meaning: V. Warnach, *Liturgie und Mönchtum*, 4, 63-5.

80. "nesciola, nullaque probitate idonea . . . animal capax disciplinae," in the covering letter to her comedies (PL 137: 974 C).

81. "stimulum disciplinae," in Hélinand, *s.*, 10 (PL 212: 562 C); *s.* 15 (602 C).

82. "Abjiciens disciplinam cito sentiet ruinam," in Othloh, *Prov.* (146: 302 D).

83. Arnulf, *Ep.* 10: "But if there must be an inquiry about his moral life, he detested Gallic want of self-restraint and was moderately strict in the Italian fashion, mindful as he was of your discipline in all things" (Giles, 98); Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ep.* IX, 3: "the rigor of the old disciplinary regime."

84. "disciplina subjectionis," *Ep.* 12 (PL 197: 166 A).

85. "dissolutio disciplinae," in Aug., *In Hept.*, 1. 7, q. 50 (PL 34: 822); *De 12 abusiv. saec.:* "a people without discipline."

86. "indisciplinata vita," *V. s. Maioli*, Bk. 1, c. 5 (PL 137: 748 A).

87. "indisciplinatio perniciosa," *Ep.* 3, 2 (MGH, *Gr. Reg.*, I, 160); 4, 38 (275); 5, 8 (290); 9, 195 (2, 183).

88. "disciplina traditionis et conversationis," in Rabanus, *In I Cor.* (PL 112: 104 A).

89. "canonum disciplina," in Gerhoh (PL 194: 106 C).

90. "disciplina legis," *Altercatio* (*RMAL*, X, 79-80).

91. "ecclesiastica disciplina," in Damasus, *ep.* 5 (PL 13: 365 A); Theophilus-Jerome, *ep.* 98, c. 19 and 22 (5: 59, 63); Origen, *In Jer.* h. 1. (25: 673 B; = h. 14: ἐνδικίαν |= *endikian*|, punishment; Kl., 120); Council of Sardinia, *ep.* n. 1 (CSEL, LXV, 49); Cassiodorus (PL 70: 841 D); Isidore (83: 723 B); Bede (95: 171 C, 264 C); Alcuin, *ep.* 6 (100: 146 B); Aimo (118: 851 A); Atto of Vercelli (134: 54 B); Berner., *V. s. Herneg.* n. 8 (157: 54 B); P. Damian (144: 205 C, 218 B); Glossa (113: 534 D); Gerhoh (194: 1303 D); etc. Cf. Hildegard (197: 397 B, 420); Manegold (*L. de lite*, 1, 382, 420); Adam of Perseigne, *ep.* 33 (Bouvet, 284); Anselm of Liège: "shaped right to the fingertips by the disciplines of the Church" (MGH, *Scr.*, 7, 192).

92. *Ep.*, 4, 5; 4, 38; 5, 57; 6, 3; 9, 204; 11, 6; 12, 10 (MGH).

93. "Disciplina exteriorem hominem componit," *In f. s. Ben.* (*COCR*, 4, 108).

94. "experientia disciplinae," in William of St. Thierry, *De nat. et dign. am.*, c. 10, n. 31 (PL 184: 399).

95. "jugum disciplinae spiritualis," in Hervaeus, *In 2 Cor.* (PL 181: 1061 B); "sound and sober folk who have been made thin and weak by spiritual disciplines" (158: 591 D); Hervé de Villepreux (?): "spiritual disciplines" (Leclercq, *R. Mab.*, 36, 10).

96. "vitalis disciplina," in Ordericus Vitalis, *H. eccl.*, Bk. I, c. 1 (PL 188: 373 A).

97. "O magistra disciplinae!" in Fr. Petit, *La spirit. des Prémontrés* (1947), 114.

98. "apostolica disciplina," in Petrus Cellensis, *De disc. claustr.*, c. 2 (PL 202: 1101 D).

99. Orthloh (PL 146: 246 D, 366 D); God. of Admont (174: 96 B); Hervaeus, *In Is.*: "the Church's sacred disciplines are yokes beneath which the monastic life is held together" (181: 352-3).

100. "socialis disciplina," in William of Saint Thierry, *Exp. alt. in Cant.* (PL 180: 482 D).

101. Ekk. 1 S. Galli, *V. b. Notk.*, c. 16 (Goldast-Senckenberg, 2, 235).

102. "disciplina claustralis," in Arno of Reich. (PL 194: 1510 A); Ph. of Harv. (203: 126 B); Gerhoh (194: 1250 C); Arnulf, *ep.* 89 (Giles, 243); Petrus Cellensis: "discipline of the cloister" (PL 202: 608 B).

103. "monastica disciplina," *V. Adalhardi*, c. 9 (MGH, *Scr.*, 2, 525); *V. s. Anskarii*, c. 3 (*ibid.*, 691); *V. s. Sturni*, c. 13 (*ibid.*, 371); Bernard of Saint Gall (PL 87: 62 D); Rabanus (107: 421 C); Paschasius (120: 1007 D: *RB.*, 1911, 426; Peter Damian, 145: 252 C); Letter from Oxford (Leclercq, *St. ans.*, 37, 183); Anon. twelfth century: "the sacredness of monastic discipline" (*ibid.*, 41, 114).

104. "monasterialis disciplina," in Bede, *V. S. Cuthb.*, c. 6 (PL 94: 742 A); Galland de Rigny, *Lib. Prov.* (J. Châtillon, 64); *Liber S. Orsierii*, c. 26: "you are sinning in the area of the monastery's discipline." *Praec. et inst. Pachomii*, 10: "against the discipline of the monastery" (*Pachomiana lat.*, Boon, 127, 56). Leidrad and others re-establish it in their diocese: Ch. Dereine, art. "Chanoines," *DHGE*, 12, 366.

105. "disciplina monachorum," in Candidus, *V. S. Eigil.* (PL 105: 390 B).

106. "observantiae disciplina," in Hervaeus, *In Is.* (PL 181: 556 D). Bede's personal account: "observance of a ruling discipline."

107. "silentii disciplina," in Adam of Perseigne, *ep.* 29 (Bouvet, 200, 203).

108. "excelsa fastigia anachoreticae disciplinae," "caenobii disciplina," *Coll.* XVIII, 11; XIX, 2 (517, 535).

109. "nostrae scholae disciplina," "temporalia disciplinarum genera," "disciplina disciplinarum," *Instr.* 4, c. 1 (Walker, 1957, 78).

110. "disciplina sapientiae"

111. *In f. Ben., s.* 1: "And blessed are you, my brothers, who have bestowed a name on the discipline of wisdom and the school of Christian philosophy" (PL 185: 101 B).

112. "clericum disciplinatum," *Disciplina clericalis*, PL 157: 671-706; 672 B; Sidonius Apollinaris, *Ep.* 1. 7, 6 (58: 572 A).

113. *De vigore disciplinae*

114. *Ep.* 4, n. 14-5 (Leclercq, *St. ans.*, 31, 70-1); Gregory, *In I Reg.*: "the vigor of discipline" (PL 79: 130 D); Jul. of Tol. (90: 773 B); Peter Damian (144: 210 C); Gerhoh (194: 1289 A, 1305 A).

115. "liberales doctrinae," "morales disciplinae," in Othloh, *V.S.W.*, n. 7 (PL 166: 399 A).

116. "doctrinae index disciplina est," *De praescr. haer.*, c. 43, n. 2 (R. F. Refoulé, *SC*, 46, 159).

117. "cujus fides et disciplina probata sit," *Praecepta Pachomii*, n. 54 (*Pachom. lat.*, Boon, 29).

118. *Ep.* 138, c. 2, n. 15 (PL 33: 531); *De s. virg.*, c. 31 (41: 413).

119. "Doce disciplinam docendo patientiam, doce scientiam illuminando intelligentiam," *In ps. 118*, v. 66 (PL 51: 347 A).

120. "per doctrinae sermonem," "per disciplinae terrorem," *Sent.*, Bk. 3, c. 51, n. 4 (PL 83: 723 B); Jonas. *De inst. regia*, c. 4 (106: 292 B).

121. "laus disciplinae," "laus scientiae," *In Cant.*, Bk. 3 (H. Bottino–J. Martini [1843], 49-50).

122. "sapientia recti dogmatis," "disciplina purae conversationis," PL 91: 939 D; 111: 681 D.

123. "scientia et disciplina," in Conrad of Fabaria, *De casibus*, c. 3 (Gold.-Senck., I, 77).

124. "Religio cum doctrina, severitas cum disciplina," in Ekk. jun., *De casibus S. Galli*, c. 1 (*ibid.*, 14). Ekk. I, *De vita b. N. B.* "In that place they were educated and nourished in knowledge and discipline" (244).

125. "fidei magisterium," "morum disciplina," *In Gen.*, Bk. 9, c. 25: "Educated in the magisterial authority of the faith and in moral discipline just like sons in the home of their father" (PL 147: 549 D). Garnier of R. (205: 641 A, 759 D).

126. "doctrina veritatis," "disciplina virtutis," Richard, *Ben. maj.*, c. 1 (PL 196: 1 B).

127. "studium lectionis," "disciplina operis," *Miscell.*, Bk. 1, tit. 91 (PL 177: 521 B).

128. Richard, *loc. cit.* Cf. Greg., *Mor.*, Bk. 16, c. 47, n. 60 (PL 75: 1150 A); *Ep.*, Bk. 1, 5 (77: 448-50); Rabanus: "discipline in the virtues" (111: 679 D); P. de Blois (207: 605 B).

129. "theoreticae disciplinae," *Vie d'Adam Scot* (Wilmart, *An. Praem.* 9 [1933], 231).

130. "tunc aliis recte disciplinam imponit, cum ipse disciplinate vivit," Pseudo-Hugh, *In reg. S. Aug.*, c. 11 (PL 176: 922 A).

131. "socialis vitae disciplinam," *In Cant.*, c. 25 (Davy, 54).

132. "in Ecclesia doctrinam, in capitulo disciplinam suscipimus," in M. M. Lebreton, *St. ans.*, 37, 119, n. 8.

133. PL 202: 441 A.

134. "disciplinae gravitas," "doctrinae veritas," *In Cant.* Bk. 1 (PL 206: 34 B).

135. Absalon, *S.*, 2 (PL 211: 24 D).

136. "suavitati salubriter additur disciplina," *In ps. 118, s.* 17, n. 2 (250, 40: 1719).

137. Cf. Dumontier, *S. Bernard et la Bible*, 95.

138. Hélinand, *s.* 28: "he has applied a new hoe of discipline to us" (PL 212: 719 C).

139. "disciplina militaris"

140. "sub disciplina regis Christi adversus diabolum dimicamus," *In Eccl.*, Bk. 1, c. 3 (PL 92: 362 BC).

141. "asperitas disciplinae," "dulcedinem internae remunerationis," in Peter Damian (PL 145: 1054 C); Greg., *Ep.*, Bk. 3, 67 (77: 667 C); Absalon (211: 89 A).

142. Pothon of Prum, *De statu domus Dei*, Bk. 3 (497 C).

143. "laboriosa disciplina," in Petrus Cellensis (PL 202: 1144 D); Matthew of Rievaulx, *Ep.* 2: "Therefore, do not dread the rigor of toilsome discipline" (*St. ans.*, 37: 178).

144. "impatiens disciplinae," "disciplinam severitatis exhibere," *In f. omn. sanct., s.* 1 (PL 183: 457 C); *In Cant.*, s. 28, n. 13 (928 B).

145. "virga disciplinae," "disciplinatas," *Ep. hort. ad virg. Deo dicatam*, c. 4 (G. Morin, *S. Caesarii Reg. sanct. virg., Flor. patr.*, 34, 1932, 50); Baudry (PL 166: 1166); P. de Blois (208: 250).

146. "correptio disciplinae," c. 65 (Koenders, 61).

147. "canonica disciplinae correctio," *Ep.* 5, 8 (MGH, *Gr. Reg.*, 1, 290).

148. "disciplinae flagella," *In Is.* (*Sp. cas.*, 3, 155).

149. "vinum disciplinae et correctionis," Wilmart, *Mém. Lagrange*, 333.

150. "virga disciplinalis," *Ep.* 35 (MGH, *Ep.*, 6, 741).

151. "verbera disciplinae," *Ep.* 4 (*ibid.*, 13).

152. "vapulatio"

153. "disciplina verberum," PL 144: 415 B, etc.; Bernard, *In Cant.*: "the rod of discipline" (183: 1195 B).

154. "publice disciplinabatur duris fragis," *Vita*, by Andrew, c. 3, n. 27 (PL 146: 777 A).

155. "disciplina corporalis," in P. F. Lefevre, *Les statuts des Prémontrés* . . . (1946), 65-6.

156. "Non ergo penitus disperdenda est virga, quamdiu puer restat, qui indigeat disciplina," in A. Wilmart, *Le recueil des Pensées du Bx. Guigue*, 386 (145); 392: "the foolish boy has had discipline withdrawn from him" (146).

157. "flagelli disciplina," PL 212: 584 D.

158. "disciplina," "compunctio"

159. *S.* 41, n. 9 (PL 198: 978 BC).

160. "severitatis disciplina," Goscelin, *Lib. confort.*, 1 (Talbot, 39).

161. "disciplina timoris," Hilary (PL 9: 561 A); Alcuin (101: 618 A); Rabanus: "to seize upon someone with harsh corrections" (108: 111 A); Garnier: "with severe discipline" (205: 690 C), etc.

162. "disciplinarum severitates," Ekk. jun., *De casibus*, c. 10 (1, 43); Aug., *Ep.* 185: "harshness of discipline" (33: 805).

163. Gilbert Foliot, *ep.* 154: "on his journey he was mindful of the need for mercy, but reserved to the heading of discipline everything that properly belonged to justice" (Giles, 1, 204).

164. "cum mansuetudine disciplina," Pontifical of the twelfth century. Cf. Aug., *Ep.* 105, c. 5, n. 16: "all discipline in a spirit of gentleness and love of charity" (PL 33: 403); Greg., *In I Reg.* (79: 458 C); Geoffrey of Vendôme, *De arca faed.*: "Although discipline may be fierce in its outward aspects, let the heart always be full of charity" (157: 225 D); Martin of Léon: "the discipline of Catholic teachers should always be tempered" (209: 111 B). Cf. Hebrews 12:6.

165. "medicinalis disciplina," *In Ex.*, h. 5, n. 1 (371); h. 7, n. 1: "the discipline exercised by the father of the family" (39); contrast this with h. 2, n. 4: "the poison of abominably bad discipline" (346); Rupert (PL 170: 42 B); Ph. of Harvengt (203: 186 D, 187 C). The discipline that a person applies to himself in mortifying his members is "the heavenly medicine of salvation": Aponius, *In Cant.*, 1.7 (124).

166. "O bona, o dulcis disciplina Dei!" P. Damian (PL 144: 473 D); Greg., *Mor.*, Bk. 20, c. 5, n. 14 (76: 145 A); Bk. 30, c. 10, n. 43: "The truest teachers are to be found in the ranks of those who have the pious knowledge that they have an inner, maternal self, even though they are given to a vigorous exercise of their fatherhood" (548 B); Ps. Max., h. 10 (57: 499 BC); Rupert, *In Is.*: "We have made our peace with God through the one who has been so harshly disciplined" (167: 1337 D); *Misc.*, Bk. 2, c. 30 (177: 602 C); Jean du Transt., *De bono pacis*, Bk. 2, c. 13 (Wilmart, 82).

167. "disciplinae moderamen," *Ep.*, 7, 42 (MGH, *Gr. Reg.*, 1, 490); 7, 32 (481); 14, 4 (2, 423); 13, 48 (2, 412). Cf. *Mor.*, Bk. 29, c. 30, n. 62: "strictness of discipline" (PL 76: 512 C); etc.

168. "iracundi doctores," "per rabiem furoris disciplinae modum ad immanitatem convertunt," *Defl.*, Bk. 2 (PL 157: 1051-2).

169. "Disciplina et misericordia multum destituitur, si una sine altera relinquatur," PL 146: 308 A.

170. "scientia," "ordinata gravitas," "tribulationum perpessio," *Ep.* 30 (Bouvet, 225).

171. Richard (?), *In Nah.*, n. 33: "Thus there is a book that deals with nature, another book that deals with discipline, and yet another book that deals with grace" (PL 96: 722 D).

172. "emendatio disciplinae," "simplicis fidei prima elementa," in Origen, *In Jud.*, h. 5, n. 6: "improvement of morals and disciplinary correction — the fundamental elements of a simple faith and religious conduct are conveyed to them" (496).

173. Gerhoh: "the Church's faith and discipline" (PL 194: 118 B). On the difference between the two concepts in tradition: V. Morel, "Disciplina," *RHE* 40 (1944-5), 17 ff.

174. "disciplina fidei," in William of Saint Thierry, *Spec. fidei:* "with much resolute zeal he subjects himself to that discipline which is said to be a hallmark of faith" (Déchanet, c. 3, p. 78; PL 180: 372 C). Cf. Ambrose, *In Luc.*, Bk. 7, c. 134: "education in the faith" (Tissot, *SC*, 52, 57).

175. "disciplina ecclesiastica fidei," Bede (PL 91: 957 D).

176. "catholica disciplina," in Sulp. Sev., *Chronic.*, Bk. 2, c. 43 (Halm, 96); Humbert, *De S. Rom. Eccl.* (Schramm, 2, 130), etc.

177. "ficta disciplina," in Origen, *In Ez.*, 4-6, n. 11 (390-1).

178. "sapientiae disciplina," *L. carol* 4 (PL 98: 1208 A).

179. "philosophia, disciplina disciplinarum," PL 199: 741 D. Macrobius, in *Sat.*, 7, 15, relates an observation on the part of Eustathius. This is also no less true of "theorica disciplina" [= "speculative discipline"] (*V. s. Idae*, 1, 6; MGH, *Scr.*, 2, 572).

180. Adam Scotus, *S.*, 41 (PL 198: 978 C).

181. *In Deut. 21*, 30 (PL 113: 487 D).

182. "disciplina pacis," *De disc. claust.*, c. 6 (PL 202: 1108-10). Cf. Is. 53: 5.

183. "ad nostram disciplinam pertinentia," *Did.*, Bk. 5, c. 7 (PL 176: 794 D).

184. Especially: "Philosophy is a meditation on death, for it is more suited to Christians, who have trodden worldly ambition underfoot and have disciplined their conduct, living as they do in the likeness of their future homeland" (PL 176: 752 B).

185. See above, n. 34. After this, in Chapters 14–20 of *Exégèse médiéval*, there comes a subdivision of the features that seemed to be attributed to "disciplina": three of them, "studium quaerendi" [= "a desire to seek out things"], "scrutinium" [= "meditative thought"], and "exsilium" [= "retreat"] are a part of "exercitium" [= "the exercise of it"]; properly speaking, discipline includes only "humilitas" [= "humility"], "quies" [= "quiet"], and "parcitas" [= "moderation"] (PL 176: 773-8).

186. Cf. P. Comestor, *s.*, 3 (PL 198: 1730 D); John of Salisbury, *Polycr.*, Bk. 7, c. 13:

> "A humble mind, a desire to seek things out, a quiet life,
> Much meditative thinking in silence, poverty, and living in a foreign land —
> All these features have a knack of revealing things that many folk find obscure."

These verses, says John, are those of "an old man from Chartres" (Bernard of Chartres)

"and although I am not taken by the pleasantness of his metre, I approve of their meaning, and I believe that they provide an accurate description of the minds of those who philosophize" (199: 666 CD; C. Webb [1909], 2, 145).

187. *Didasc.*, Bk. 3, c. 14: "The discipline of princes, then, is humility" (PL 176: 7773 C); Aug.: "this is almost a Christian discipline"; Adam Scotus, *Solil. de instr. animae,* Bk. 1, c. 1: "in the school of Christ, you become acquainted with the disciplinary facets of humility" (198: 844 A).

188. *Did.*, Bk. 5, c. 10 (PL 176: 798 C). *De inst. Nov.*, c. 8: "You brothers, therefore, who have already entered the school of discipline, should seek to read Scripture with the idea of using it to provide yourselves with the moral underpinnings for virtue rather than seeing it as a whetstone on which to sharpen your sense of subtlety" (176: 933 D. Father Baron, *op. cit.*, xxix, restores this work, which B. Hauréau had attributed to Ithier, to Hugh). *De modo dic. et medit.* (compilation of the twelfth century): discipline is necessary for the student, "so that living in a praiseworthy way he may combine morals with knowledge" (176: 877 B).

189. *Did.*, Bk. 6, c. 2 (176: 799 B).

190. *Ep.*, 6: "by disciplinary applications of paternal correction you have come to the perfect maturity of manhood, and you have strengthened this maturity by being instructed in the sacred disciplines" (PL 100: 145 D).

191. Note that in Latin "eruditio" is a cognate polar opposite of "ruditas." This gives point to the following passage from Peter Comestor, *s.*, 39: "You, who judge the earth, have been taught Psalm 2 . . . Thus its meaning is as follows: you have been taught, that is, be ones who are taught ('estote eruditi'), raised above all uncultured coarseness ('extra omnem ruditatem'). For there are two kinds of uncultured coarseness, that of the mind and that of the body. Uncultured coarseness of the mind is ignorance, while uncultured coarseness of the body is uncleanness. Accordingly, it is your responsibility to have both — wisdom and cleanness" (PL 198: 1813-4); *s.* 12 (1755 A) and 20 (1778 A).

Notes to Chapter One
§2. Scripture and Revelation

1. For the two final centuries of the Middle Ages: Dom Paul de Vooght, *Les sources de la doctrine chrétienne . . .* (1954).

2. "Nihil utiliter ad salutem spiritualem praedicamus, quod Sacra Scriptura, Spiritus sancti miraculo fecundata, non protulerit, aut intra se non contineat," *De concordia praescientiae . . . ,* q. 3, c. 6; "In this way, therefore, Sacred Scripture contains an authoritative warrant for all the truth that reason acquires, since Scripture either affirms it openly or does nothing to deny it" (PL 158: 528 BC); "(From Scripture) we receive whatever we sow healthfully in God's fields for the nourishment of our souls" (A).

3. Texts in Spicq, *Esquisse,* 65-6.

4. *Helmodi Chronica Slavorum,* Bk. 1, pref.: "For in the shadowy darkness of this world, if the lamp of Scripture is not lit, everything is lost and obscured by blindness" (MGH, *Scr.*, 21, 11).

5. "secundum fidem catholicam, seu secundum sacram Scripturam," in Anselm of Havelberg, *Dialogi,* Bk. 1, c. 2 (PL 188: 1143 D).

6. "Scriptura sancta, magistra fidei nostrae," in Werner of Saint Blaise, *Deflor*, Bk. 2 (PL 157: 1011 D).

7. Cf. Anselm of Laon, *In Ap.* (PL 162: 1531 C).

8. Anselm of Havelberg, *Dial.*, Bk. 3, c. 2: "The Universal Church, which is diffused throughout the world, can be discerned to exist in three ways. That is to say, whatever she holds true is arrived at by the authority of Sacred Scripture or universal Tradition or a truly peculiar and unique customary usage, etc." (PL 188: 1211 BC). Cf. Jerome, *In Is.*: "according to the traditions of the Church" (24: 279 C); etc.

9. Cf. Manegold, *In ps. 59:* "The sword represents the words that are preached, and they resound with the Gospel. The words that are preached resound" (PL 93: 795 A and B).

10. "so that, errors having been purged from it, the purity of the Gospel itself might be preserved in the Church. This was a promise that the prophets voiced early on in Holy Scripture, and Our Lord . . . was the first to proclaim it with his own lips, commanding his Apostles to preach it to every living creature, as if it were the *fountainhead* of all saving truth and disciplined morality." This unique source, the Gospel, is not to be assimilated to a book. The Gospel is promised, promulgated, and preached. Its objects, truth and discipline, are contained "in written books and in traditions that are not written." But these are not, properly speaking, "sources." Text of 8 April 1546. Cf. Edm. Ortigues, "Ecritures et traditions apostoliques au conc. de Trente," *RSR* 36 (1949), 271-99. Of course, in a more material and less pregnant sense, two "sources" can and must be taken into account in practical terms; cf. H. Lennerz, "Scriptura sola," *Gregorianum* 40 (1959), 38-53. To use language that is fairly current, a great number of "sources" can also be taken into account, "sources" being documents of any description that are more or less ancient and of greater or lesser authority.

11. Cf. H. Holstein, "La tradit. des Apôtres chez Irénée," *RSR* 36 (1949).

12. Cf. Henri de Lubac, *Histoire et Esprit*, 61-8.

13. Gr. d'Elv., *Tr.* 6: "As food is ground up by the teeth, so also the word of God, which is the bread of life, is masticated by the apostolic tradition, which can be compared to teeth, and it is evidently submissive to all the organs of the Church's body" (75); Rabanus, *In Gen.*, Bk. 4 (PL 107: 66-7); etc. Cf. Bernard, *In f. omn. sanct.*, s. 1, n. 5 (183: 455 C).

14. Origen, *In Lev.*, h. 7, n. 4: "It seems right to me to adhere just as closely to Jesus' apostles as to our Lord and God, Jesus Christ himself, and to receive knowledge from divine Scripture according to the tradition that stems from them" (383); Hippolytus, *De Antich.*, c. 2. Cf. René Roques, *L'univers dionysien* (1954), 226: "Scripture is envisaged by Dionysius as a gift from God that is transmitted to us by the hierarchy." Only under the terms of this condition could Scripture be "likened to a great living body" capable of communicating life: Epiphanius, *Panarion, Haer.* 42 (PG 41: 813 A).

15. *Entretien avec Héraclite* (J. Scherer, 155).

16. *Mor.*, Bk. 35, c. 14, n. 26: "Indeed, they eat bread in his home, because in Holy Church they are fed with the harvest fruits of sacred eloquence" (PL 76: 763 D); "Then they eat bread in his home since, when they have finished paying close attention to the overlying literal sense, they are fed in Holy Church by the very choicest fruits of mystical eloquence, as it were" (763 BC). Conversely, the Church lives in the household of the Scriptures: Origen, *In Cant.*, Bk. 3 (220).

17. Rupert, *In Ap.*, Bk. 7, c. 12: "For indeed Sacred Scripture . . . is a great eagle,

and the two wings of this eagle are the two Testaments, which are given to this woman, that is to say, are made intelligible to her, so that she may have the means with which to lift up her heart to heaven" (PL 169: 1061 B).

18. "figurata sacramenta (Scripturae) non alibi aperiuntur nisi intra Ecclesiam," Autpert, *In Ap.*, Bk. 7 (572 C).

19. Gerhoh, *In ps. 146*, n. 8 (PL 194: 976 CD).

20. "Apostolos duodecim, per quorum ministerium et nobis Scriptura novi Testamenti condita est, et Instrumenti veteris, donante Domino, revelata mysteria," Angelome, *In Reg.*, Bk. 3, c. 7 (PL 115: 452 A).

21. Honorius, *In Cant.* (PL 172: 449 B); Godfrey, *Fons phil.*, v. 662 (58); etc.

22. "lac et mel, id est vetus et novum Testamentum in Ecclesia," Bede, *In Ex.*, c. 3 (PL 91: 294 D).

23. "omnes petendi sunt in sinu Ecclesiae, quae firmamentum est et columna veritatis," *loc. cit.*, 89, n. 7.

24. "Interpretatur Sinai *rubus*, quod significat Ecclesiam, in qua et Dominus Moysi loquitur," Rabanus, *In Ex.*, Bk. 2, c. 11 (PL 108: 92 AB). Cf. Augustine, *In Ps. 103*, s. 1; n. 8: "God placed the authority of Scripture in his Church" (36: 1341).

25. "in fide catholica tractata," Augustine, *Gen. litt.*, Bk. 12, c. 37, n. 70: "Indeed, I know that several of those who are praised for having dealt with Sacred Scripture before us in the Catholic faith . . ." (PL 34: 484). J. Leclercq, *Spir. de P. de Celle*, 101.

26. 2 Peter 1: 20: "no prophecy of scripture is a matter of one's own interpretation." Cf. Bachiarius, *Prof. fidei*, c. 6 (PL 20: 1034 A). The rule was not questioned, even when this text was understood in another way.

27. Richard, *De erud. hom. int.*, Bk. 2, c. 6: "There is no doubt that there can never be a proper interpretation of the Scriptures without the Magisterial Authority of the one who inspired them" (PL 196: 1305 AB). A complementary aspect of the traditional teaching.

28. "Sacra Scriptura non est nisi filiis Dei scripta, quibus mater Ecclesia per clavem David aperit omnia clausa," Honorius, *Eluc.*, Bk. 3, c. 27 (PL 172: 1154 A); *Sp. Eccl.*: "Paradise is the Church, in which are to be found all the delights of Scripture" (943 A).

29. Aponius, *In Cant.*, Bk. 3 (52); William of Saint Thierry, *In Cant.*, c. 38 (M. M. Davy, 66); etc.

30. Cf. *Enarr. in Cant.*: "She has the eyes of a dove, because she understands the science of Divine Scripture with a chaste, simple look, seeking after the spiritual and divine senses to be found in it" (PL 117: 300-1).

31. "Ecclesia legit et tenet," in Hugh of Rouen, *Dial.* (PL 192: 1206 D).

32. Cf. J. Daniélou, concerning Origen: "When Origen contrasts the literal sense of Scripture to its hidden sense, he means that Scripture contains a total interpretation of the world and that it is the duty of the intellect to disengage this interpretation. . . . He is simply laying claim to the legitimacy of theology"; "Or. comme exégète de la Bible," *St. patr.*, 1, 289.

33. "Sacra Scriptura quae theologia dicitur," *Brevil. prol.* (Q., 5, 201). Durand de Mende, *Rat. div. off.*, Bk. 6, c. 1, n. 12: "One reads the first book of theology, namely, Genesis" (1672 edition, 252); Ockham, *Dial.*, c. 2: "The science of Divine Scripture, which is called theology" (Goldast, 2, 400); etc.

34. "Theologia quae sacra Scriptura dicitur," *In Boet. de Tr.*, q. 5, a. 4.

35. "sacra doctrina," "Sacra Scriptura"

36. "Qui nova pandendo, sed non antiqua silendo,
Littera quae celat vetus aut nova scripta revelat,
Dogmatis immensi dux primus in urbe Remensi
Testamentorum pandens secreta duorum."

Anselm, *Life of Adalbert II of Mainz*, v. 549-603 (Jaffé, *Bibl. rer. germ.*, 3, 586).

37. *De doctrina christiana*

38. Augustine, *Ep.* 120 (PL 33: 452-62); Rupert, *In Os.*, Bk. 1 (168: 47 CD); William of Saint Thierry, *L. de nat. et dign. am.*, c. 10, n. 31 (184: 399 A). Cf. Origen, *Philokalia*, c. 13: ". . . in order to explain Sacred Scripture" = in order to engage in theological work; or yet again: "for the furtherance of Christianity" (J. A. Robinson, 64-5).

39. "divinarum Scripturarum dogmata," *Vita S. Sequeni* († c. 580), n. 7 (cited by Roger, 166, n. 6).

40. "Scripturarum sacramenta," *In Is.*, Bk. 6 (PL 24: 207 AC).

41. *Ep.* 15 (1: 46).

42. "divinae doctrinae eruditio," *Mor.*, Bk. 23, c. 25, n. 49: "Once again, knowledge of divine doctrine is signified by the bread" (PL 76: 281 D).

43. "sacri eloquii erudiri mysteriis," *Mor.*, Bk. 15, c. 13, n. 16 (75: 1088 BC).

44. "legem et secundum spiritum et secundum litteram novit," *Antik.*, Bk. 1 (PL 96: 610 B).

45. "expositio Scripturarum," Eigil, *V.S. Sturmi*, n. 13: "when he had explicated Sacred Scripture to his brothers" (MGH, *Scr.*, 2, 371).

46. "secundum sanctae Scripturae traditionem," *ibid.*

47. "Notatio de illustribus viris qui ex intentione sacras Scripturas exponebant aut ex occasione quasdam sententias divinae auctoritatis explanabant."

48. "Habemus in Francia novum de veteri magistro theologum, qui ab ineunte aetate sua in arte dialectica lusit, et nunc *in Scripturis sanctis insanit*," *C. quaedam capitula errorum Ab.* (PL 182: 1053 A).

49. "intelligentia Scripturarum"

50. "innumeros intellectus"

51. "Fecunda est enim veritatis auctoritas, et dum diligenter discutitur, de se gignere quod ipsa est cognoscitur," in Pseudo-Augustine, *De assumpt.*, c. 1 (PL 40: 1143; first half of the twelfth century).

52. *Ep.*, Bk. 3, 67: "thus, working from the basis of one, single, unitary knowledge of Sacred Scripture, expositors also make use of innumerable understandings to fashion various ornaments, as it were, all of which are of profit to adorn the heavenly spouse" (PL 76: 668 AB). Abelard cites this passage, *Intr. ad th.*, Bk. 1, c. 20 (178: 1028 B).

53. *In ps. 18*, s. 2, n. 4: "Some words of Scripture have been useful in their very obscurity, since it is precisely their obscurity that has spawned many understandings" (250, 38: 108); *In ps. 126*, n. 11: "For, as things turn out, things have been laid out rather obscurely for a reason, namely, so as to generate many understandings from which men might derive enrichment" (40: 1865).

54. "Noverit quod prisci Patres, sylvam sanctarum Scripturarum penetrantes, diversos atque innumeros sanae fidei ex ea ramos praeciderint e quibus, ob multorum utilitatem et divinae servitutis honorem, salutiferas formulas ediderint." *De inst. laic. praef.* The word "formula" here does not have the meaning of dogmatic formula; Jonas is thinking first and foremost of the development of institutions: "For this reason, too,

the canonical and monastic institution that performs devoted service depends on Christ" (PL 106: 124 A).

55. "Quinque autem panes quibus multitudinem populi saturavit, quinque sunt libri Moysi, quibus spirituali intellectu patefactis et abundantiore jam sensu multiplicatis, auditorum fidelium quotidie corda reficit." Pseudo-Bede, *In Jo.* (PL 92: 706 A); Rabanus, *In Ex.*, Bk. 3, c. 10: "Sacred Scripture is full of spiritual and divine knowledge, and the very same knowledge from which Scripture itself took its rise and was established never ceases to be augmented and multiplied" (108: 145 A).

56. "ad investigandum et exponendum sanctae Scripturae arcanum usque in finem dimittetur." *In Ruth* (Pez, 4, 463). Cf. Bonaventure, *In Hexaem.*, coll. 13, n. 2: "thus an infinite number of theories can be drawn from Scripture . . . these would be new theories and new meanings" (Q., 5, 388).

57. *De una . . . deit.*: "Many meanings . . . remain hidden and are known only by the few who happen to have a deeper understanding. And these meanings never enjoy a surer or more opportune affirmation than when there is a compelling need to answer heretics" (PL 125: 482 A).

58. "Oportet haereses esse." *In ps. 7:* "This is not allowed to happen without there being a facet of it that is useful to the faithful. On account of heretics, true Catholics are forced to examine and understand the truth that resides in the decisions and judgments that come from God. For this reason the Apostle Paul says . . ." (PL 93: 521 C). *In ps. 54:* "His heart, that is to say, God's heart, is Sacred Scripture, which is called the heart of God, because it contains the inner, hidden mysteries that come from God. Scripture draws nearer to us, that is to say, it is laid open to us and made clearer. . . . Because the heretics had to be rebuffed and driven back, it became necessary for Catholics to seek out the truth of the Scriptures, so as to be able to resist the untruths of the heretics. And so they drew nearer to Scripture, since the more they studied it, the more they understood it" (770 C). Werner, *Defl.*, Bk. 2 (157: 1050 C).

59. "Quomodo appropinquavit cor illius? Ut intellegemus voluntates illius. Etenim ex haereticis asserta est catholica, et ex his qui male sentiunt probati sunt qui bene sentiunt. Multa enim latebant in Scripturis; et cum praecisi essent haeretici, quaestionibus agitaverunt Ecclesiam Dei, aperta sunt quae latebant, et intellecta est voluntas Dei." *In ps. 54*, n. 22 (250, 39: 672-3); *In ps. 7*, n. 15: heretics draw Catholics from their slumbers and force them to make a deeper study of Scripture (38: 46); *In ps. 67*, n. 39: "the proven defenders of these meanings either continued to be hidden and unobtrusive or else they were not so much conspicuous themselves, but rather were made to seem so by the contradictory errors of the proud" (39: 896-7).

60. "Nam revera contentionibus haereticorum excitati, principes ac duces nostra fidei, orthodoxi atque catholici viri, altius profunda Scripturarum scrutati sunt, et ita puteum aquae vivae 'foderunt atque paraverunt in baculis suis.' . . . Baculi ducum vel principum nostrae multitudinis quibus foderunt puteum 'in datore legis,' fortes ac perseverantes animi fuerunt, quibus pugnando magistri Ecclesiae contra blasphemias haereticorum veritatem nobis aperuerunt Scripturarum 'in datore legis,' id est, cooperante gratia Dei. . . . Quia duces et principes foderunt, quia Scripturas sacras fideliter exponendo, nobis intelligibiles fecerunt." *In Num.*, Bk. 2, c. 13 (PL 167: 891-2).

61. "Per haereticos facit Dominus quae cogitavit, quia dum ipsi quosdam de Ecclesia ad suos errores pertrahunt, alii de fide et agnitione veritatis probatiores fiunt. — Unde sequitur: 'Complevit sermonem meum,' quem praeceperat a diebus antiquis.

Sermo namque Dei, quem a diebus antiquis praeceperat, sacra Scriptura intelligitur, quae jam olim mundo edita est; sed adhuc ex magna parte occulta. Quae cotidie in mentibus fidelium completur, quando ipsi, haereticorum quaestionibus excitati, ad majora virtutum studia succrescunt, et ad altiorem divinorum eloquiorum intelligentiam proficiunt." *In Thren.* (PL 175: 304 BC). John of Salisbury, *Polycr.*, Bk. 7, c. 12: "seeing that the treasure-house of the Holy Spirit . . . can never be exhausted" (199: 666 AB).

62. "In domo Patris mei multae sunt mansiones."

63. "Scripturae sacrae eloquium multiforme et multiplex est in sensibus. Unde quidam dixit: Caelestia terrenis comparat, ut quod incomprehensibilis magnitudo vetat intelligi, per notissimas similitudines possit adverti. In Scripturae enim verbis serendis mira potentia est, ut subito nobis immensa atque incomprehensibilia duobus vel tribus sermonibus explicentur. . . ." Wilmart, 66. A nearly contemporary text (Council of Frankfurt, 794) has: "But the holy, Catholic, and apostolic Church, although it has spread out through the whole world, is nonetheless the one mistress that is closest to the bridegroom and is the dove who with her silver wings gleams with the beauty of sacred eloquence, and the rest of her body, with its pallid sheen of gold, is all alight with the purity of her perfect faith" (MGH, *Conc.*, 2, 136). See below, Chapter 2.1.

64. "ob causas diversarum significationum una eademque res in sacra Scriptura modis pluribus, dummodo ab unitate fidei non recedatur potest accipi." *Trip. tab.*, p. 3, c. 9, n. 155 (PL 198: 760 C).

65. Anselm, *Dial.*, Bk. 2, c. 14; Nicetas: "From the one body of Scripture diverse legitimate understandings are elicited"; Anselm: "What you say is excellent" (PL 180: 1184 C). Cf. Origen, *In Jer.*, h. 5: "Indeed, Christ is all things that are of God. . . . But although there is one notion that underlies the text, it is articulated in different words to account for a variety of meanings" (PL 25: C 27 AB = h. 8, n. 2: Kl., 57).

66. *In Jo.*, tr. 49, n. 12 (250, 36: 426); *In ps. 18* and *In ps. 126* (see above, n. 53); *C. Maxim.*, Bk. 2, c. 22, n. 3 (PL 42: 795); etc.

67. Ep., Bk. 3, 67 (see above, n. 52).

68. *Sent.*, Bk. 1, c. 18, n. 5: "The language of the Lord is adapted to each individual according to the capacity of his understanding. And while this language of the Lord is diverse, in that it is adapted to the understanding of each and every person, in itself, however, it remains one" (PL 83: 576 BC).

69. "de novo ac veteri Testamento sacramenta fidei diverso sermone aperuerunt." *Ep.* 5, n. 12 (Walker, 1957, 50).

70. "multiplex intellectus," "intellectus de mysterio Christi." *In Eph.* (PL 181: 1232 B).

71. "Ut doctrina multiplex fiat, manente eadem veritate." *De arca Noe mor.*, Bk. 4, c. 9 (PL 176: 678 D).

72. "multiformem gratiam simplicis verbi Dei, non uno tantum modo piis mentibus intimandam, sed variis tractandam esse doctrinae schematibus." *Ep.* 12 (ca. 1145); *Epistolae* (Giles, 1, 23).

73. "In sacra Scriptura, quot sunt expositiones, totidem relucent intelligentiae."

74. *De nat. rer.*, Bk. 2, c. 154 (239).

75. Rabanus, *Cl. inst.*, Bk. 3, c. 15 (PL 107: 391 D); J. Scotus, *Div. nat.*, Bk. 3, c. 24 (122: 690 BC); Alvarus (121: 537 AB); Honorius, *In Prov.*, 22, 27 (172: 324 B); Hervaeus, *In Is.* (181: 591-2); etc.

76. *Ep.* 82, c. 1: "Since it is not permissible to disagree with even one word of

evangelical and apostolic doctrine, or to taste of divine Scriptures in any other way than as the blessed Apostles and our fathers received and taught them" (PL 54: 918 A).

77. Benedict XV, encyclical *Sp. Paraclitus:* "They will wander miserably from the proposed scheme of things, if . . . they go beyond the sure limits and boundaries fixed by the Fathers." Cf. Leo XIII, *Provident.*

78. "Sensus Scripturarum sanctarum . . . ex Patribus sanctis ad nos usque pervenit." Robert of Tomb., *Sup. Cant.* (PL 79: 538 C); Honorius (172: 324 B).

79. "Per annos tredecim, omnibus Graecorum saecularium libris remotis, solis divinae Scripturae voluminibus operam dabant, earumque intelligentiam non ex propria praesumptione, sed ex majorum scriptis et auctoritate sequebantur, quos et ipsos ex apostolica successione intelligendi regulam suscepisse constabat." Bk. 2, c. 9 (PL 21: 518 B). Cited by Leo XIII, enc. *Providentissimus.*

80. "Monumentum Christi est divina Scriptura, in qua divinitatis et humanitatis ejus mysteria densissima veluti quadam muniuntur petra." *H. in Prol. Jo.:* "Of necessity faith is the first to find its way into the tomb of Sacred Scripture, then following on faith, knowledge enters the tomb, its entry having been prepared for by faith" (PL 122: 284-5).

81. Rupert, *Div. off.,* Bk. 8, c. 15 (PL 170: 233-5); "it is a well-known interpretation of the learned" (234 A).

82. "novitatum amator," *Disp. alt.,* Bk. 3: "a lover of novelties and the subtlest academician of his times" (PL 180: 321 B).

83. *Ibid.,* c. 3 and 4: "This is the new theology of a new theologian . . . everything he does is new, he uses new words and embraces new dogmas" (255 C, 258 C). See above, n. 48.

84. *Introductio ad theologiam*

85. *Summa scholarium.* Likewise the subtitle of the *Elucidarium* of Honorius, "A Dialogue on the Summa of All Christian Theology," is probably late. H. Ostlender, "Die Theologie "Scholarium" des Peter Abaelard," *Beiträge Bäumker* 3 (1935), 263-81.

86. "It came about that . . . I wrote a certain theological treatise on the unity and trinity of God for our scholars" (PL 178: 140-1). Bernard, *C. quaedam cap. err. Ab.,* c. 3, n. 6: "How speculatively our theologian surveys the invisible aspects of God!" (132: 1059 C). Meanwhile Abelard had conceived the project of a doctrinal summa that he would have called "Theologia." Cf. J. Rivière, *RDSR,* 1936, 50-5.

87. "divinae paginae intelligentiam." Prol.: "To the extent that I have been able to satisfy the requests of our students, I have written a summa of sacred learning, an introduction to Divine Scripture, as it were" (178: 979 A). Cf. Hugh, *De sacram.,* Bk. 1, prol. (176: 183-4).

88. *Th. chr.,* Bk. 2: "Sacred Scripture . . . knowledge of which so abounds with a delightful abundance of every kind of mental and spiritual sustenance, that it alone encompasses the perfection of doctrine through a threefold exposition" (178: 1210 AB).

89. *De sacramentis christianae fidei*

90. "sacra theologia," *In Ap.,* Bk. 7, prol. (PL 196: 857 D). What is being discussed is the Book of Revelation, the author of which, Saint John, is called "the holy theologian" (864 B, 873 B, 878 B, 882 B, 888 A).

91. "Le recours à l'Ecr. sainte dans l'enseignement de la th. morale, 1. le moyen âge," *B. des Fac. cath. de Lyon 2* (1955), 5-19.

92. *Enseignement des lettres classiques d'Ausone à Alcuin,* 184, 443-4; "a narrowly

utilitarian objective." In the main the reproach is directed less at someone like Cassiodorus or Alcuin than at Christianity itself; 144: a conception like this "bids fair to weigh heavily on all education during the whole course of the Middle Ages and even a considerable time beyond that."

93. "Sicut enim aurum per ferrum splendescit, sic sacra Scriptura per saeculares disciplinas fulgescit," in Werner, *Defl.*, Bk. 2, where there is a commentary on 2 Tim. 2:20: "The great house is the Church. The vessels of gold and silver are the authoritative, sacred volumes. The vessels of iron and clay are secular writings, which are necessary for more outward, superficial reasons, etc." (PL 157: 1103 A). Grammar, the foremost key to the study of the Bible, was called "the literal science" or sometimes "the key to the Scriptures."

94. "Dicta paganorum poetarum, licet faeda sint, quia non sunt vera, multum tamen adjuvant ad percipiendum divinum eloquium." Ermenric, *Ep. ad Grimaldum* (c. 854), c. 25 (MGH, *Ep.*, 5, 563).

95. "Sic grammatica, sic dialectica, sic geometria, sic astronomia, divinae Scripturae sapidissime sale conditae, quae gustatae solebant affere mortem, . . . admistione farinae, id est gratiae, praestant salubrem refectionem . . . cum, edoctis saecularibus litteris, divinas studiosius legant, acutius intelligant." Petrus Cellensis, *De disc. claustrali*, c. 6 (PL 202: 1109 BC).

96. Hildebert, *Life of Saint Hugh of Cluny*, c. 1, n. 2: "With a foretaste . . . of grammar, by which he was introduced to the divine heights of Scripture" (PL 159: 861 A).

97. Charlemagne, *De litt. col.*: "so that you may be able more easily and properly to penetrate the mysteries of Divine Scripture" (L. Wallach, *Speculum*, 26, 290).

98. Rodolphe of Saint Trudo, *V.S. Lietberti*, c. 3: "He is led to the fountainhead of philosophy by a thirsty heart, and there he quaffs from the seven streams that have a threefold taste. At one point, he studies logic, then he goes on to sweat over physics, and then he leaves some free time for ethics. His intention, to the wonderment of his teachers, is to penetrate into the labyrinthine pathways of Scripture" (PL 146: 1451 A).

99. Honorius, *De an. exs. et patria*, c. 12: "By these arts, when one has gone through city after city, as it were, one reaches Sacred Scripture, which is akin to a true homeland. In this homeland many-faceted wisdom holds sway" (PL 172: 1245 C).

100. "Ad unum terminum cuncta referenda sunt, et quae in libris gentilium utilia, et quae in Scripturis sacris salubria inveniuntur, ut ad cognitionem perfectam veritatis et sapientiae perveniamus, qua cernitur et tenetur summum bonum." *Cl. inst.*, Bk. 3, c. 2 (PL 107: 379 C). Cf. Ozanam's penetrating reflections, in *La civilisation au Ve siècle*, particularly the ninth lesson on how humane letters made their entry into Christianity (3d ed. [1875], 333-75).

101. Once again this is what Curtius says, 575. Cf. A. Coville, *Gontier et Pierre Col* (1943), citing Delaruelle: The Middle Ages did not make classical antiquity "a disinterested object of study that was in itself its own proper end, except in the case of very rare and very fleeting exceptions, which have been mentioned." Let us add: Thank God!

102. J. Gonsette, *S. Pierre Damien et la cult. profane* (1956), 39.

103. H. Urs von Balthasar, *Dieu et l'homme d'auj.* (French trans. by R. Givord), 77-9.

104. *Secretum*, 2 (French translation by R. Marcel).

105. H. Fichtenau, *L'empire carolingien* (French trans. by Barbey-Vandou, 1958), 114 and 126. Cf. Origen, *In Gen.*, h. 2, n. 2: "we bring outside questions to bear on our

established propositions, and we adopt these questions when it comes to making a formal declaration of our principles" (103).

106. *L'amour des lettres,* 130-1. Com. M. Roger, pp. 447-8.

107. "litterarum scientia sublimatum." *V. s. Otmari abb. Sang.,* c. 1 (MGH, *Scr.,* 2, 41).

108. "scientiae meritum." Rod. of S. Trud., *V. s. Lieth.,* c. 4 (PL 146: 1451 CD); Stephen of Fougères, *V. s. G. Firmat.:* "his was a shining distinction in the area of liberal studies" (ASS, April. 3, 335); etc. On the seven arts in ecclesiastical biographies of the tenth century: Ghellinck, *Mouvement,* 104.

109. Cf. the judicious remarks of B.B., *RTAM* 6 (1950), 89.

110. Jacques Le Goff, *Les intellectuels du m. âge,* 13. Cf. Gilbert Highet, *The Classical Tradition,* 2d ed. (1951), 8.

111. "Mihi satis apparet propter seipsam appetenda sapientia." *Ep.* 1 (L. Levillain, 1, 6).

112. Thus MGH, *Capit.,* 1, 61-2, 79, 80, P. Lehmann, in *I problemi sulla civiltà carolingia* (Spoleto, 1954), 330-3.

113. "ut qui Deo placere appetunt recte vivendo, ei etiam placere non negligant recte loquendo." *De litt. colendis* (Wallach, 290). Recently it has been written that under the Carolingians "the prince . . . rested easy as soon as Christians made their Easter duty"; in any case, this was not true of Charlemagne.

114. He would like to see "a desire to live life well" united with "a desire to be well-spoken" (Havet, 42).

115. Winidharius (of S. Gall?) (MGH, Poet. lat., 1, 89-90):

> "It is this stout hero who puts an end to fierce wars,
> King Charles, who is second to none in the brilliant splendor of his heart.
> He has not suffered thorn-ridden errors to creep into books.
> Behold the corrections that he has so fittingly made,
> Sublimely advanced as he is in every area of learning."

116. French translation cited by De Lubac is by Carl Nordenfalk, *Les grands siècles de la peinture, le haut moyen âge,* p. 158. Cf. Eric of Auxerre, preface, *V. S. Germani,* to Charles the Bald: "You have multiplied the dwelling places of knowledge . . ." (Hauréau, *H. de la phil. scol.,* 1. 148). Theophilus called for the opening of a school in each village, etc.

117. "Sapientia tantummodo propter Deum, propter puritatem animae, propter veritatem cognoscendam, etiam propter seipsam diligatis." PL 101: 850 B. Cf. as early as Virgil of Toulouse, *ep.* 4: "Philosophy consists of loving and caring for wisdom, which is the font and matrix of every art and discipline. For this reason, anyone who is full of a pure love and tender care when he approaches wisdom, anywhere in heaven or on earth, is rightly said to be a philosopher" (17).

118. "Alcuine nomen erat sophiam mihi semper amanti . . ." (5. 23). Wallach, "The Epitaph of Alcuin, a Mode of Carolingian Epigraphy," *Speculum* 30, 368; Alcuin, *Praecepta vivendi,* 182: "The almighty loves the person who is to be found always loving wisdom"; *De cella sua,* v. 33:

> "You may take flight and go, but, as for ourselves, let us always love Christ. . . ."

119. ". . . Qui semper sophiae magnus amator erat."

120. Haskins, for instance, 155. On the poetic culture of the high Middle Ages and its limits, cf. Fr. Chatillon, "Arbiter omnipotens et le symbolisme de l'Alpha et de l'Omega," *RMAL* 11 (1955), 5-50.

121. M. Deanesly, *H. de l'Europe du haut m. âge*, French translation by S. M. Guillemin (1958), 648.

122. Haskins, 130.

123. Bardy, *Recherches*, 126-8. On Isidore and Virgil: Fontaine, 155, 204-5.

124. Godefroy Kurth, "S. Gr. de Tours et les ét. classiques au VIe siècle," *RQH* 24 (1878), 586-93.

125. F. Cabrol, *L'Angleterre chrétienne* (1909), 44-5.

126. "doctorum radix," *Ep,*. Bk. 1, 18 (J. Léglise, 1906, 114).

127. "virgiliaca mendacia"

128. "Virgilii Musa mendacia multa colorat," in Alan of Lille, *Anticl.*, Bk. 1, c. 4 (PL 210: 491 C); Alvarus, *Ep.* 4, n. 10 (121: 433 A); Monk Syrus, *V. S. Marioli*, Bk. 1, c. 14: "Some time ago he had read . . . the books of the ancient philosophers and the lies of Virgil" (137: 752 A); Ermenric, *Ep. ad Grim.*: "now let us put behind us that utter liar . . . Virgil"; "Neither Plato nor Virgil was able to achieve such heights of knowledge as to know God" (MGH, *Ep.* 15, 564).

129. "evangelica veritas." "This was not something that could be discovered in the lies of Virgil, but was to be found abundantly in the truth of the Gospel" (*Spec.*, 26, 475). There is a similar attitude on the part of Saint Anselm, who does not explain Virgil to his students, but goes on nevertheless to recommend that they should read him: *Ep.*, Bk. 1, 55, to Maurice (PL 158: 1124 D); etc.

130. *Ep.* 13 (MGH, *Ep.*, 4, 13; pp. 38-9). Cf. *ep.* 162: "while the books of secular literature and the solid wisdom of the Church are to be found in your midst, as is only right and proper" (260).

131. "fabulam de Maronis salsura contexere"

132. *L. de corp. et sang. Dom.*, *Ep. ad Carolum regem*, and *Prol. ad Placidium* (PL 120: 1262 B, 1266 B); *Carmen 1* (Poet. lat. 3, 48).

133. *Vita S. Amandi, proem.* (MGH, *P. lat. aevi car.*, 3, 568).

134. Alvarus, *V. Eul.*, c. 3, n. 9 (PL 115: 712-3).

135. J. M. Clark, *The Abbey of St. Gall* (1926), 102.

136. It is useful to recall a beautiful passage from Newman's *Historical Sketches*, vol. 3 (1873), which points out the Virgilian ideal of "tranquil calm and a life that is incapable of deceit," an ideal that was eminently realized in the Benedictine monastery: "such a life may be called emphatically Virgilian."

137. Dungal, *Adv. Claud.*: "the great champion of Latin eloquence" (PL 105: 484 D). Godfrey of Rheims (eleventh century), *Calliope*, v. 382 (A. Boutemy, *RMAL*, 3, 361):

> "It was a time when the language of Virgil used to please me in a thousand ways. . . ."

138. John of Salisbury, *Pol.*, Bk. 8, c. 14: "Virgil's divine epic song" (PL 199: 768 D). Paschasius: "one of the eminent poets" (120: 1531 A).

139. L. Maitre, *Les écoles épiscopales*, 226.

140. "luxuriosa facundia"

141. Syrus, *loc. cit.*: "The divine poets, he said, are enough for you. You do not

need to pollute yourselves with Virgil's luxuriant eloquence" (PL 137: 752 A). The same phrase is attributed to Alcuin in the anonymous *Vita Alcuini*, c. 10, n. 19 (100: 101 C), which does not smack of the true spirit of Alcuin. Cf. Ebert, 2, 377-8.

142. "quia ipsa verborum alta vis facile inserpit fibras cordis. . . ." Thierry of Fleury (Manitius, 2, 455). Cf. Augustine, *Confessions*, Bk. 1, c. 13, n. 21-2 (Labriolle, 1, 18-9).

143. "Aurea Roma iterum renovata renascitur orbi. . . ." Eclogue of the ninth century (Ebert, 2, 77). Cf. W. Strabo (PL, *aevi car.*, 2, 373); Theodulph (Raby, *Saec. P.*, 1, 190); etc.

144. "Otium sine litteris mors est, et vivi hominis sepultura," in "In amorem claustri et desiderium lect. div." (Morin, *RB*, 31, 248). Cf. Wipo (c. 1030): "An acquaintance with humane letters is a light to souls" (H. Bresslau, 66). John of Salisbury, *ep.* 143 (199: 130 B).

145. "cum evangeliis bucolica meditari." For Abbon of St. Germain and Létald of Micy: Leclerq, *RMAL*, 3, 114-5. Cf. Odilo of Cluny adapting Virgil, *Aeneid*, 1, 198-207 (PL 142: 921): "O my brothers, who once braved many dangers. . . ."

146. Peter the Venerable, *ep.*, Bk. 2, 22 (PL 189: 235 C).

147. Thus, for example, Rupert, *In Jo.* Bk. 1: "Listen, all of you that are sons of light, and abhor, as if it were a spider's web, anything that has come from the dream-visions of those who are sons of night, which is to say, the philosophers of this age" (PL 169: 209 BC); *In Ex.* (167: 599-600).

148. Cf. Godefroy Kurth, *Origines de la civilisation moderne* 2 (1898), 263, on the spirit of the Carolingian renaissance: "This young and enthusiastic spirit did not descend into the tomb of antiquity so as to be buried with it, but in order rather to unearth the treasures that it found buried there. We must admire the extent to which Carolingian society maintained a consciousness of itself and a sense of its true mission in its stubborn struggle to win the golden fruits of knowledge." Cf. Roger, 326.

Notes to Chapter One
§3. Queen of the Arts

1. *L. formularum sp. intellig.* (C. Wotke, 5-6). See below, Chapter 3.

2. *H. in Prol. Jo.*: earth = history; water = ethics; air = physics; fire = theology. Like many others, John Scotus does not specify whether it is a matter of four kinds of interpretation or four series of texts: "Seeing that Divine Scripture is an intelligible world, constituted of its own four parts just like the four elements" (PL 122: 291 BC).

3. *In Matt.*: "Behold, knowledge of physics was laid open to us in history, while knowledge of logic was made known to us in the spiritual dimension. Ethics can also be found, if we conduct our investigation according to the dictates of anagogy" (PL 106: 1285 D; cf. 1267 AB). See below, Chapter 3.2.

4. *In Gen.*, c. 28: "And just as some almonds have three layers of fruit on them, that is, the rind, the shell, and the stone, so does Sacred Scripture, which the Jewish people understood, encompass a threefold understanding of itself, that is to say, physics, ethics, and logic, which is to say in turn, an historical, allegorical, and moral meaning" (PL 115: 212 B).

5. *Strom.* 1, c. 28. See below, Chapter 3.

6. *In Cant. prol.* (75-9); Ambrose, *In ps. 36* (PL 14: 1011).; *In Luc. prol.*, n. 2-4 (SC, 45, 40-2); etc.

7. *Anonymous Life of Saint Aldric, Archbishop of Sens* (†837), n. 3: "He began . . . to acknowledge that an increase of religious sentiment was connected with an augmentation of doctrinal knowledge. In this way, knowledge could be effectively grounded not only in the liberal disciplines but also in the spiritual disciplines" (PL 105: 800 C); Al. Neckam, *De nat. rer.*, Bk. 2, c. 173: "The practice of the liberal arts is useful for a more accurate comprehension of the underpinnings of theological speculation" (234); etc.

8. Acts 7:22. Gregory, *In 1 Reg.*, Bk. 5, c. 3, n. 30 (PL 79: 356 B); etc.

9. "Quis enim nesciat et in Moysi ac prophetarum quaedam adsumpta de gentilium libris?" Jerome, *Ep.* 70, c. 2 (3: 209).

10. "Aegyptus mater est artium," Richard, *Lib. exceptionum*, P. 1, Bk. 1, c. 23 (J. Châtillon, 3).

11. ". . . Satis est potuisse videri
Moseum ante omnes totum cecinisse per orbem
Quae sint, quae fuerint, quae mox ventura trahantur
Omnia . . ."

Virgilio-centones, Deprecatio ad Deum (ed. 1601, 7).

12. Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Panegyric* (PG 10: 1049-1105); Origen, *Letter to Gregory; In Gen.*, h. 2, n. 2: all the sciences are required "for a formal declaration of our law" (103).

13. "septem Athenienses alumnae," J. Walther, *Hortus deliciarum* (1952), 69-70. Cf. *L'amour des lettres*, 192, 253-4; Al. Neckam: "the seven lights of the world" (497); Crispo of Milan: "the sevenfold liberality of eloquence" (PL 89: 369).

14. "culmen Scripturarum," Alcuin, *Grammat.* (PL 101: 853-4), citing Proverbs 9:1; Honorius, *De an. exs.* (172: 1241-6). Cf. Th. d'Alverny, "La Sagesse et ses sept filles . . . ," *Mél. Félix Grat.* 1 (1946), 245-78.

15. ". . . hos septem peperit theologia perennis," Martin of Dacia, manuscript cited by Roos, S.J., *Die Modi significandi des Martinus de Dacia* (1952), 81-2.

16. "Ut enim multae aquae ex diversis fontibus in unius fluminis alverum confluunt atque decurrunt, ita naturales et liberales disciplinae in una eademque internae contemplationis significatione adunantur, quam summus fons totius sapientiae, qui est Christus, undique per diversas theologiae speculationes insinuat. Et fortassis hoc est, quod per psalmistam de beato viro dicitur: 'Et erit tanquam lignum, quod plantatum est secus decursus aquarum', hoc est, sicut Christus erit, in cujus significationem typicam omnes naturales artes, intra quarum terminos tota divina concluditur Scriptura, concurrunt. Nulla enim sacra Scriptura est, quae regulis liberalium careat disciplinarum." *Sup. Hier. cael.*, Bk. 3 (PL 122: 139-40); Aug., *Doct. chr.*, Bk. 2, c. 27-41 (C.F., 303-33); Cassiodorus, *Inst. div. litt.*, c. 27 (70: 1140-1); Rabanus, *Cl. inst.*, Bk. 3, c. 18 ff. (107: 395 ff.); Rupert, *De Sp. sancto*, Bk. 7 (167: 1755-84); Hugh, *Didasc.*, Bk. 6, c. 3 (176: 799-800). See especially Abelard, *Intr. ad th. prol.* and the whole work (178: 979-1114).

17. *In Matt.*, c. 2: "All these three philsophies of the Greeks are also to be found in Sacred Scripture. What is more, the whole of philosophy and all the modes of the philosophers existed in Divine Scripture before they did in the works of worldly

sophists, since, to the extent that they possessed anything worthwhile, they possessed it as a gift from God" (PL 106: 1284-5); Bernon (142: 1146 D).

18. "Cum plane intelligeret sanctus Bruno sacram Scripturam, praeter divinorum mysteriorum revelationem atque legislationem, humanarum etiam cognitionum thesauros continere . . ." *Vita*, c. 15, *De Br. sapientia* (PL 164: 129-30).

19. Ep. Gunzonis (a. 960; M.D., *Vet. scr.*, 1, 310-2). On this letter: Ebert, 3, 398-401. Cf. Lactantius, *Div. inst.*, Bk. 7, c. 14, on the antiquity of the world (PL 6: 781 A); Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topogr. christ.*, Bk. 1 (PG 88: 57-60).

20. Sirach 1:1. Cf. Origen, *In Num.*, h. 18, n. 3 (170-1).

21. Origen, *C. Cels.*, Bk. 3, c. 74 (1, 266); *In Rom.*, Bk. 2, c. 14 (PG 14: 919 B).

22. Abelard, *Intr.* (PL 178: 979 BC).

23. Prologue on the epistles of Paul (Engelberg manuscript): "on account of certain likenesses that are introduced into theology from there" (Leclercq, *Miscell. Lombardiana*, 3).

24. "Nobis sufficit, quantum in Scripturis legitur, tantum de hac arte sentire, quia nimis indecorum est hinc humanam sequi sententiam unde quantum nobis expedit divinam noscimus habere doctrinam." Cf. Cassiodorus, *De art. et disc. liber. litterarum, in fine* (PL 70: 1218-20). But a note informs us that everything that begins with "quia" and follows after it is not in the manuscript that has been utilized; and the judgment is in fact contrary to *Inst.*, c. 27 (1140-1). Tertullian himself had admitted that profane studies "are indispensable."

25. J. de Maistre, *2e lettre sur l'éduc. publ. en Russie* (*Lettres et opusc. inéd.*, 5th ed., 2 [1869], 299).

26. "Ingressae sunt ergo septem artes liberales tanquam famulae in sacrum et reverendum dominae suae sapientiae triclinium, et quasi de triviis licentiosis ad districtum et severum verbi Dei magisterium dispositae et assidere jussae sunt . . . — Quid autem dicimus artes istas in scholam illam tunc intromissas? Potius dici poterat, cum prius nescirentur introisse extunc, intus apparuisse illas. Nam qui scienter scrutati sunt Scripturas, ita invenerunt, ita experti sunt, et satis admirati non solum quod illic essent, verum etiam quod ita dominae sapientiae luce et majestate subopertae laterent, ut non facile conspici posset quod illic essent. . . . Maxime autem idcirco non parent cum ibi sint, quia videlicet sic illis sancta Scriptura utitur, ut tamen non dicat qualiter eisdem utendum sit. . . ." *De Sp. sancto*, Bk. 7, c. 10 (PL 167: 1763-4); *De vict. Verbi*, Bk. 11, c. 2 (169: 1444 AB).

27. *In ps. praef.*, c. 15 (250, 97: 20).

28. "Omnia in Scripturarum sanctarum amplissimis pratis per partes inveniri (possunt), quae artigraphi in suorum hortorum arcolis posuere: inveniuntur, inquam, virtute sensuum, non in promulgatione verborum; in radicum profunditatibus, non in foliorum lapsibus. Sic enim in profunditate divinarum Scripturarum liberales artes ab studiosis quibusque cernuntur, sicut vina in vitibus, segetes in seminibus, frondes in radicibus, fructus in ramis, arborumque magnitudines sensu contemplantur in nucleis." Bk. 2, c. 30 (PL 98: 1106 A).

29. Bede, *De schematis* (PL 90: 175 B). Rupert, *De Sp. sancto*, Bk. 7, c. 11: "Thus even the other forms or kinds of form are found here and there in Sacred Scripture, and indeed the Greeks pride themselves on having been the discoverers of such figures or tropes. But since Sacred Scripture is preeminent over all other writings not only in its authority, inasmuch as it is divine, or in its usefulness, inasmuch as it leads to eternal

life, but in its antiquity, this boasting of the Greeks is not only vainglorious, but also false" (167: 1765 D). As early as Cassiodorus we find the following *(In ps. 22):* "Thus the beginning, middle, and end of that psalm are radiant with the beautiful light of diverse forms" (250, 97: 209-14).

30. "quasi totus eruditionis fons," Aelred, *De oner.*, s. 2 (PL 195: 363 C).

31. *In Is. prol.* (PL 24: 19 A).

32. Thus Hel. of Froidmont, *De cogn. sui*, c. 2 (PL 212: 723 AB). The idea came from Origen, *In Cant.*, Bk. 2 (141).

33. "Nosce teipsum."

34. *Spec. Eccl.*: "In the second age bread is served to us by Abraham, while . . . he is said to have taught astronomy in Egypt" (PL 172: 895 D). *De imag. mundi*, Bk. 3: "He taught the Chaldeans astronomy and the Egyptians geometry" (168 B); Isidore, *Etym.*, Bk. 3, c. 25, n. 1, simply said: "The Egyptians first discovered astronomy. In truth, the Chaldeans first taught . . . astrology" (82: 169 C). Cf. c. 10, n. 1; c. 27, n. 1 (161 B, 170 A).

35. *Strom.*, 1, c. 5, n. 30 (SC, 25, 67). For Philo, cf. W. Völker, *TU*, 49, 1 (1938), 171-2; H. A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers* (1956), 97-111.

36. *Philokalia*, c. 13, n. 1 (Robinson, 64-7).

37. "pedissequa," *Ep.*, Bk. 9, 9 (PL 58: 625 AB). See below, Chapter 4.5.

38. "Ista (Scriptura) est domina artium, et ei caeterae ut pedissequae famulantur." *Epit. hist. sacrae*, Bk. 6, c. 13 (PL 118: 851 A).

39. *Op.* 36, c. 5: "Whenever this knowledge of the humane arts is applied to the study of sacred eloquence, it should not arrogantly claim for itself any rightful authority, but, like a maidservant of the mistress, should be subject to it with a servile obedience" (PL 145: 603 CD).

40. Et. Gilson, *Et. de phil. méd.* (1921), 306.

41. *De Sp. sancto*, Bk. 7, c. 8: "Let him carefully mark the progress of Sacred Scripture, and at the same time let him remain zealously devoted to dialectic and rhetoric. He will see that these maidservants attend her as if she were their mistress" (PL 167: 1762 C); *In Ex.* (583 D).

42. "Studiorum omnium Theologia gubernatrix et magistra reverenda," M.D., *Th. nov. an.*, 1, 372.

43. "Quomodo omnes artes subserviunt divinae sapientiae," Bk. 1, prol., c. 6 (PL 176: 185 CD).

44. *Benj. minor*, c. 3: "Now . . . you are not surprised that Rachel is so deeply beloved, since even her maidservant (I speak with the wisdom of the world, which is reckoned as foolishness in comparison with the wisdom that plays the role of mistress to the wisdom of this world) is sought, as we see, with so much love and longing by worldly philosophers" (PL 196: 3 D). In the *Liber exceptionum* he wishes to study "the matter of mundane and divine scripture, and how mundane scripture is subject to divine scripture" (P.1, prol., J. Châtillon, 97-8).

45. "Artes liberales sunt subsellia et quasi substructura theologiae, et usque ad pedes ei serviunt." *De tropis loquendi* (Dumoutet, AHDLMA, 14, 182).

46. "Cum cunctas artes, cum dogmata cuncta penitus
Noverit, imperium Pagina sacra tenet."

Entheticus, v. 373-4 (PL 199: 973 D).

47. "Ecce Puella poli residens in culmine, caelum
Despiciens, sursum delegans lumina . . .
Inflammat diadema caput quod, lampade multa
Gemmarum radians, auro flammatur et extra
Scintillans, lapidum duodeno sidere fulget.
Librum dextra gerit, sceptrum regale sinistra
Gestat, et ad librum plerumque recurrit ocellus . . ."

Anticlaudianus, Bk. 5, c. 83-84 and 101-5 (Bossuat, 125-6).

48. "liberalium artium ponte introductorio, in imperialem theologicae facultatis regiam"

49. "What is this unworthy presentation that is being made to the person of the queen herself, seeing that the maidservants who guard her door have not been consulted?" (J. M. Parent, *Beitr. Bäumker* [1935], 3, 306).

50. ". . . Moyses, qui omni sapientia Aegyptiorum sapientissimus perhibetur, greges septem filiarum sacerdotis Madian ad puteum legitur adaquasse, ut per hoc daretur intelligi quod iste qui praecipuus theologiae fuit praedicator, profundis sanctarum mysteriis septem liberalium artium amatores imbueret; et ex ipsis philosophiae artibus theologicam sapientiam comprobaret. Nam . . . theologia in hoc omnes praecellit, quod in his omnibus ei omnes famulantur. Nam sub eo sensu, qui est in significatione vocum ad res, historia continetur, cui tres scientiae famulantur, grammatica, dialectica, rhetorica. Sub eo vero sensu qui est in rerum significatione ad facienda mystica, continetur tropologia. Et his duobus deserviunt arithmetica, geometria, musica, astronomia, et physica. Quidquid vero vel sub historia, vel sub allegoria, vel sub tropologia docetur, causa hujus pacti, id est nostrae restaurationis edocetur." *S.* 34 (PL 205: 789-90).

51. Ghellinck, *L'essor*, 1, 220, who adds in a somewhat harsh tone that his thought is "without interest."

52. "Ad hoc enim liberales artes inventae sunt, ut theologiae deserviant. . . . Ubi enim magis indigemus verbo, quam cum loquimur de Verbo? Ubi magis indigemus ornatu verbi, quam cum de Verbo loquimur, specioso forma prae filiis hominum? Unde. . . . Ubi magis indigemus rationali verbo, quam cum loquimur sapientiam? Ergo tanquam pedissequa grammatica deserviat verbo, ornatui verborum rhetorica, logica rationi. . . .

. . . Et in hoc, quasi pedissequa dominae, Physica deservit Theologiae." *S.* 23 (PL 205: 723 CD).

53. "monachorum scholasticus insignis"

54. On Rabanus's *De inst.*: Laistner, 306-8. Ed. by Knöpfler (1901).

55. "librorum exercitatio," "lectionis studium," "lectionis sacrae studia"

56. Willib., *Vita Sancti Bonif.*, c. 2, n. 7: "He displayed arduous perseverance in his night vigils and was so zealously attentive to a meditative consideration of divine reading that in the end his erudition in the area of Scripture was enormous. This erudition was as apparent in his eloquent practice of the art of grammar and in the rich measure of his metrical fluency as etc." (MGH, *Scr.* 2, 336).

57. *Ep.* 75: "Let your venerable wisdom also promote a special zeal for reading in the house of God. There should be youths who read and a chorus of singers and training in the use of books, so that through your conscientious efforts the dignity of that holy

Church may be restored" (PL 100: 252 C); "so that through your most earnest and pious concern the reading of Holy Scriptures may be restored as much as possible and ecclesiastical dignity may be exalted everywhere" (253 B); *Ep.* 52 (218 AB).

58. *Ep.* 1: "I have schools of readers . . . who . . . attain the fruits of spiritual knowledge in their meditation on the divine books" (MGH, *Ep.* 4, 542-3).

59. "lectio divina"

60. "Let us therefore have leisure for divine reading" (PL 9: 570 A).

61. *Ep.* 3, c. 4 (Lab. 1, 14); *Ep.* 22, c. 25: "When you pray, you are speaking to your spouse; when you read, it is he who speaks to you" (136); *In Tit.* 3, 9: "let the mind feed daily on divine reading."

62. Art. 8, 38, 42, 48, 49, 72; Benedict of Aniane, *Conc. reg.*, c. 55 (PL 103: 1176). On this "lectio": U. Berlière, *L'ascèse bénéd.* (1927), 169-84.

63. *Mor.*, Bk. 13, c. 20, n. 38 (PL 76: 274 AB), etc.

64. Cyprian, *Ad Donat.*, c. 15: "Let your prayer or your reading be constant. One time you converse with God, at another time God converses with you" (Hartel, 15).

65. "quia in libris sanctis Deus loquitur ad hominem, et in orationibus suis homo loquitur ad Deum," Alcuin, *Ep.* 51: "just as light delights the eyes, so does reading delight hearts" (PL 100: 616 D); *De virt. et vit.* 5 (101: 616 D; which is in accord with Augustine, *s.* 302, 39, 2324); Paulinus of Aquileia, *Lib. exhort.*, c. 9 (99: 205 B); Smaragdus, *In reg. S. Ben.*, c. 4, n. 56 (102: 784 C; cf. 597-8); Adalgar, *Admon. ad Nonsuidam reclus.*, c. 13: "For when we pray, we converse with God, and when we read, God converses with us" (134: 931 C); *L. de modo bene viv.*, c. 50 (184, 1272 B); Serlon of Savigny (Wilmart, *R. Mab.*, 11, 36). Yet again John of Salisbury (?), *De septem septenis*, sect. 6 (199: 955 C); Bernard of Monte Cassino, *Spec. monach.*, P. 3, c. 5 (H. Walter, 198).

66. "orationis holocaustum," M. of Léon, *s.* 11 de div. (PL 209: 167 D). Cf. Eigilis, *Vita s. Sturmi*, c. 2 (MGH, Scr., 2, 366); H. Métel, *ep.* 49 (401).

67. Alcuin, *Ep.* 180 (PL 100: 451 D); *Lib. de virt.*, c. 5 (101: 616 C).

68. Alcuin, *Ep.* 1 (100: 139 A), etc.

69. "divinae paginae," Augustine, *In ps. 91*, n. 1 (250, 39: 1279); *In Jo.*, tr. 6, n. 24 (36: 65); Gregory (PL 76: 217 A); *L. Carol.* 3, c. 17 (89: 1149 A); Paschasius (120: 64 B, 1061-4); Alvarus (121: 526 C); Rupert (169: 974 B). Yet again Geoffrey of Auxerre, *C. cap. Pict.*, n. 1 (185: 595 C).

70. "sacrae paginae," Primasius (PL 68: 816 B, 843 C); Greg., *Ep.* 3, 29 (MGH, *Ep.* 1, 187); Charlemagne, *De litt. col.* (MGH, *Leges*, cap. 1, 79); Braulio: "sacred and divine pages" (P. Madoz, 84); Godescalc (Lambot, 38); Humbert, *De S. Rom. Eccl.* (Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom. u. Renov.*, 2, 128); Hroswitha, *In Com. praef.* (PL 137: 971 D). Again Petrus Cellensis, *s.* 76 (202: 874 C).

71. "sanctae paginae," Augustine (PL 44: 463); Gregory (76: 58 AB); etc. The "pagina sancta" of Jerome, *Ep.* 22, c. 17 (1, 126), is only an apparent exception, since it refers to the page on which the codex is found open. Cf. Peter the Venerable, *Poème apol.*: "The sacred page will be a complete witness for me" (Wilmart, *RB*, 51, 55).

72. "antiquae paginae," Bede, *Ep.* 6 (PL 94: 687 A).

73. "Testamenti veteris paginae," Gregory, *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, h. 6, n. 17 (PL 76: 836 D); Leo, *s.* 66, c. 2 (54: 365 C).

74. "Scripturarum sanctarum paginae," Gregory, *Dial.*, Bk. 4, c. 48 (PL 77: 409 B); Bede, *In Cant.* (91: 1216 C); Autpert, *In Ap.* (478 H, 528 C); Rabanus (110: 583 B); Aimon, *In Ap.* (117: 999 B); Jonas, *V. Columbani*, Bk. 2, c. 17 (*Vitae sanct. in usum schol.*, 1905, 268).

75. "sacri eloquii paginae," Gregory (PL 76: 1249 D; 77: 474 C).

76. "paginae divinarum litterarum," Bede, *Ep.* 6 (PL 94: 686 D).

77. "evangelicae paginae," Alcuin, *Ep.* 122 (PL 100: 356 C); Braulio: "pages of the New Testament" (Lynch, 365; Madoz, 131); Leo, *s.* 64, c. 1 (54: 358 B); cf. *ep.* 139, c. 1 (1105 D).

78. "utriusque Testamenti paginae," Autpert, *In Ap.* (571 C); Leo: "the sacred pages of the Old and New Testaments" (PL 54: 757 A, cf. 242 A). Again Giraud l'Anglais, *De libris a se scriptis:* "the sacred pages of both Testaments" (*Opera*, 1, 1861, 417); Burchardus: "the pages of the Old Testament as much as the New Testament" (F. Stegmuller, *Mél. de Ghellinck*, 2, 727).

79. "series paginarum," Willib., *V. s. Bonif.*, c. 2, n. 8 (MGH, *Scr.*, 2, 336).

80. "paginae perennes," Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 13, n. 18 (p. 99).

81. Anon. (Leclercq, *Ecrits mon. sur la Bible*, 104).

82. "divina pagina," Guibert de Nogent (PL 156: 29 C, 111 C); G. Babion (171: 766 D); Williram of Ebersberg, *In Cant. prol.*, n. 4 (Seemüller, 1878; but perhaps not authentically); William of Conches, *In Cons. Boet.* (Parent, 128); Stephen of Tournai, *Poèmes de jeunesse* (Delhaye, ET, 193); Robert de Monte (PL 160: 421 C; v. 1184); Adam Scotus (198; 160 A); *Vie d'Ad. Scot.* (Wilmart, *An. Praem.*, 9, 230); John of Salisbury, *H. pont.*, prol. (M. Chibnall, 3); Roger of Wendover, *Chron.* (H. D. Coxe, 1, 2); Joachim of Flora, *Sup. 4 ev.* (Buonaiuti, 6, 318); Albertus, *Sup. V. et N.T.* (G. Morin, *RB*, 27, 118-9; antedates the twelfth century?); Abelard (188: 1285). As early as Augustine, *In ps. 45*, n. 7: "pagina divina" (PL 36: 518) and Paschasius (MGH, *Ep.* 6, 147).

83. "sacra pagina," Abelard (PL 178: 1170 A); Marbodius, *V. S. Rob.*, c. 6 (171: 1522 CD); Richard (199: 743 B, 878 B); *Isag. in th.*, prol. (Landgraf, 64); *Ep. cujusd. doct.* (M.D., *Vet. scr.*, 1, 790); Robert of Melun (Martin, 1, 3 etc.); Joachim of Flora, *Sup. 4 ev.* (295); etc. In *Sacra pagina, hist. d'un mot et transformation d'objet primitivement désigné* (*Mél. Pelzer* [1947], 23-60), Father de Ghellinck gives some other examples — without taking note of the transition from the plural to the singular.

84. "caelestis pagina," Al. Neckam, *De nat. rer.* (3, 18, 165, 257); *De laud. div. sap.* (426, 453, 500).

85. "Veteris ac Novi Testamenti pagina," *L. carol.* 3, c. 14 and 17 (PL 98: 1140 A, 1149 D); Ordericus Vitalis, *H. eccl.*, Bk. 3, c. 1 (188: 229 A).

86. "universa pagina sacri verbi Dei," Rupert, *In Is.*, Bk. 1, c. 34 (PL 167: 1307 D).

87. "lectio." It will also be noted that "lectio," which in the beginning sometimes meant the text itself, which is to say, in fact, the book (Jerome, *Ep.* 52, c. 7: 2, 181) (Alcuin, *Ep.* 10, PL 100: 153 D), afterward became uniquely the fact of reading, and then explicating. Cf. G. de Nogent (156: 111 C); Richard (196: 743 B), etc. In the work of Julian of Toledo, *Progn. praef.*, the two senses are found one after the other (96: 454 D, 455 A). In certain cases there is cause for hesitation, as, for instance, in Cassian, coll. 14, c. 9: "he persists in his zeal for 'lectio' " (Pichery, SC, 54, 194).

88. "lectores divinitatis," Hugh, *Did.*, Bk. 3, c. 14 (PL 176: 774 D).

89. "magistri divinorum librorum," Abelard, *Intr. ad th.*, Bk. 2, c. 5 (PL 178: 1056 B).

90. "doctores sacrae paginae," Peter of Poitiers, *Alleg. sup. Tab.* (93).

91. "magisterium divinae lectionis," Abelard, *H. calam.*, c. 3 (PL 178: 140).

92. Hugh, *Did.*, Bk. 5, c. 10 (PL 176: 798).

93. Peter Comestor, *s.* 12: "There are those who excel in it (Scripture). These are

scholars, who in their zeal take constant pains with Sacred Scripture. But I am afraid that they excel in it with a view to transitory things, that it is their desire in this way to enlarge their status with honors, to be enriched with possessions, and to be bloated with favors" (PL 198: 1756 C).

94. Garnier de R., *s.* 33: "There are also other wise men, attentive to sacred eloquence, not so that they might complement and fulfill it with work, not so that they might live simply, but rather so that they might have seats of honor in the marketplace and be called Rabbi by men" (PL 205: 782 D).

95. "Qui legit publice sacram Scripturam, iter majoris perfectionis arripuit quam aliquis clarevallensis." Dickson, "Le Card. Robert de Courson," *AHDLMA* 9 (1934), 73. An earlier indication of this attitude of mind can be found in the complaint of Anselm of Laon and William of Champeaux against Rupert, who had criticized their opinion: "They objected to Rupert's inexperience and ignorance, inasmuch as he was well content in a monastic cloister and had never seen so many masters or their like" (Mabillon, *An. OSB*, 5, 624; in Delhaye, *Traditio* 5 [1947], 238).

96. Smalley, XV.

97. Helinand, on worldly clerics and scholars: "With their blushing cheeks and inflated gullets, they have the audacity publicly to make their professions of doctrine by adverting to the sacrosanct mysteries of the Holy Scriptures — those swollen gluttons, with their distended stomachs, choking on their words" (PL 212: 634 A).

98. "scolastici"

99. "urbes et orbem circuire solent, ut ex multis litteris efficiantur insani," Helinand, *s.* 15 (212: 603 A).

100. John of St. Arnoul, *V. Joannis abb. Gorz.*, n. 33: "it is as if they were in a kind of school of heavenly disciplines, where with all the strength of their holy talents they are busy studying all the virtues that are tried and true" (PL 137: 258 D).

101. G. Foliot, *Ep.* 81: "You are a truly blessed philosopher who have placed your goods where the hand of the greedy plunderer cannot snatch them. For quite a while now we have been stationed in the schools and unlike our opponents we have heard about poverty of spirit . . ." (Giles, 1, 106).

102. "superna philosophia . . . scolasticae disciplinae," *Life of Saint Martin of Vertou* (died around 601): "renouncing scholarly disciplines, he turned all the inquisitiveness of his mind to the investigation of the mysteries of heavenly philosophy" (A. SS. oct., 10, 806).

103. Pothinus, *De statu d. Dei* (496 G). Paschasius, *In Matt.* (PL 120: 395-8).

104. "schola Christi"

105. Aponius, *In Cant.*, Bk. 7 (126); cf. Bk. 8 (161).

106. Sermon by an anonymous author (Leclercq, *R. Mab.*, 36, 5); Rupert: "Cuno the Christ-Lover" (PL 168: 1307; 170: 477 D); Renier of Liège (204: 153 C); *Vita s. Ebeh.*, 3; *Passio Thiemonis*, 7 (MGH, *Scr.*, 11, 79, 55).

107. *V. S. Folcuini Tarv. prol.* (PL 137: 555 A). It is the "school of charity": William of St. Thierry (184: 396 D). "The opposition between the cloister and the school has become a literary theme": C. Mohrmann, CCM, 1, 281.

108. Helinand, *s.* 15 (PL 212: 603 C). Cf. Rupert (167: 1570 B).

109. Thus says Hugh Metel, *Ep.* 40: "renouncing the military service of the world, let us enroll ourselves in the military service that is spiritual" (386); G. Crispin: "in Christ's military guard" (Ghellinck, *Essor*, 2, 171); etc.

110. Letter 30, to Robert Poulain: "Now he who applies himself to philosophy in the classroom that is given over to this kind of wisdom ought not to be unacquainted with the liberal disciplines by which this philosophy is encompassed and taught. For the letter of blessed James enumerates them, saying . . . Behold, there are seven, and they are disciplines, and they are called liberal etc." (J. Bouvet, 225). Bk. 29: "those who profess a heavenly philosophy" (203). See below, n. 114.

111. "theologia divina," Hugh, *In Hier. cael.* (PL 175: 926-7).

112. "divinitas"

113. "Divinae pariter et humanae philosophiae fluenta potavit," Rupert, *V.S. Hereb.*, c. 4 (PL 170: 393 D).

114. G. Bardy, " 'Philosophie' et 'philosophes' dans le vocab. chrétien des premiers siècles," *RAM* 25 (1949), 97-108.

115. "philosophia Benedicti patris," Bruno of Querfurt (died 1009, *V. S. Adalb.*, c. 27 [Curtius, 259]); Adam of Perseigne, *S. in f. S. Ben.*: "Just as worldly and secular philosophy is taught in seven disciplines which are called liberal, so in the philosophy classroom of the cloister, which is governed by the magisterial authority of Benedict, there are seven rules of divine art, by which the lives of the just are trained and educated for life. . . . Your youth are educated, becoming truly free, if they learn those liberal arts, not the ones which worldly philosophy makes a great, blustering show of in her classrooms, but rather the ones which the true Plato, from his teacher's seat on the cross, after having been condemned by Pilate, teaches by the Wisdom of God in our streets and proposes to us through you. Then, without a doubt, when you sit down humbly at the teacher's seat that is the cross, you have heard, you have seen, you have read in the book of life everything that you have commanded your little ones to retain. For Christ is the book of life, the virtue of God and the wisdom of God. . . . In reality, I would say, fit the liberal arts to your teachings, which . . . convey you from the servitude of philosophizing to true freedom. Come then, brothers, let us inquire and philosophize on the basis of those arts . . ." (*COCR*, 4, 1937).

116. "dominici schola servitii"

117. "schola Christi"

118. "claustrale"

119. John of Salisbury, *Polycr.* (Webb, 1, 100); etc.

120. "verae philosophiae discipulus," Petrus Cellensis, *Ep.* 160 (PL 202: 605 A); *ep.* 75: "the solitude of the heavenly philosophy is a gymnasium" (522 C).

121. "Longe in melius disciplinarum studia commutasti, et pro Logica Evangelium, pro Physica Apostolum, pro Platone Christum, pro academia claustrum, tota jam et vere philosophica mulier, elegisti." *Ep.*, Bk. 4, 21 (PL 189: 347-8).

122. "meditatio" and "oratio"

123. "quaestio" and "disputatio." J. Leclercq, H. Wolter, S.J., "Meditation bei Bernhard v. Cl.," *Geist u. Leben* 29 (1956), 206-18.

124. *V.S. Eigilis*, c. 18: "At table there a reading from the law of God was recited. Occasionally a question about the reading (quaestio lectionis) was interjected. When this reading had been read through, a spiritual conversation (confabulatio spiritalis) took place among them, seeing that they were serious and intellectually distinguished men. As a result of their efforts many different benefits were realized for God's churches in various ways" (PL 105: 396 CD).

125. "disputatio"

126. διαλογή, διάλεξις

127. "disputator"

128. "verus disputator"

129. "veritatis et falsitatis discretor"

130. *C. Cresc.*, Bk. 1, c. 6-34 (PL 43: 450-68).

131. *Praecepta Pach.*, 19-20: "When prayers are finished . . . let them confer with each other about what they have heard the prefects disputing. . . . Furthermore, let there be a disputation by the prefects of the houses three times a week, and during the disputation itself the brothers will sit or stand and not change their order" (*Pachomiana latina*, A. Boon, 1932, 17-8; this Latin is Jerome's).

132. *De int. Job* (PL 14: 827 C); *Ap. David alt.* (903 C).

133. *Ep.* 22, c. 35: "Medius, whom they call father, began to dispute. While he spoke, there was such a great silence that nobody dared to look at anybody else, nobody dared to cough" (I, 150).

134. *De mor. Eccl. cath.*, Bk. 1, c. 31, c. 67: "having scorned and forsaken the allurements of this world, they gathered together to lead a communal life dedicated to the highest ideals of chastity and holiness. They spent time together, living lives of prayer, reading, and disputation. There was no puffed up pride etc." (PL 32: 1338).

135. *In Jo.*, tr. 115: "Those are the matters they pursue. . . . But they must deal with other matters by making use of disputation" (250, 36: 646); *In ps.* 63, n. 19: "A psalm is sung, the gospel is read, the reader's voice rings out, as does the voice of the disputant" (39: 821); S. 361, c. 1: "the beginning of our disputation" (PL 39: 1599). Cf. *Retract.*, Bk. 1, c. 1, n. 2: "in what is said by any ecclesiastical disputant" (Bardy, 278).

136. *In Ez.*, h. 4, n. 1: "Furthermore, if you do not think that consent should be given to this disputation (361). . . ." The process of explaining is still styled "discutare" (Origen, PG 12: 497 C, etc.).

137. "allegorica disputatio," "tropologica disputatio," *Ad Elfrid., Ep.* 5 (MGH, *A. ant.* 15, 491); cf. *ep.* 8 (500).

138. "disputatio lectionis," *V.S. Geremari*, c. 4: "The third hour of the day, after the disputation about the reading" (PL 156: 1207).

139. "disertus atque cautissimus disputator," Cassiodorus (PL 70: 110 C); Joannes Monachus [= Jean Lemoine]: "Augustine is an eloquent disputant"; Huguccio and others: "Augustine is pre-eminent when it comes to disputations."

140. "disputationes"

141. "multa de sacramentis continent disputata," *Retract.*, Bk. 2, c. 20 (Bardy, 484). Cf. *City of God* (Bardy's French edition, 1959; introd., 131-2).

142. Bk. 1, c. 1 (Brandt, 3). Cf. Bk. 6, c. 3: "philosophers in their disputations" (485), etc.

143. Jonas, *Inst. laic.*, Bk. 1, c. 5 (PL 106: 131 D).

144. *Reg. past.* (PL 77: 13 A).

145. Prol.: "in which he finds it disputed in a right and Catholic way" (PL 107: 145 D).

146. "semper ad montem cursum suae disputationis direxit," *In Cant.*, Bk. 5 (94). In Macrobius "disputatio" is interchangeable with "tractatus": *Saturn.*, preface and Bk. 7, c. 1 (Eyssenhart, 4, 405).

147. "insigne disputationis genus"

148. "in tegumentis allegoriae," Tr. 16: ". . . to uncover and reveal in the light of true knowledge the prophetic senses that are clad in the vesture of allegory" (169).

149. "allegoriae disputationes," *De prom.*, p. 2, c. 7, n. 12 (PL 51: 775 D).

150. "tortuosae disputationes"

151. "velut siliquis porcorum," *ibid.*, p. 4, c. 14, n. 23 (849 A).

152. "catholice disputata," Sulpicius Severus, *Dial.*, Bk. 1, c. 6 (Halm, 158).

153. "de circumcisione magnifice disputavit," *Ep.* 36, c. 1 (2, 51).

154. "de Scripturis disputans," *Ep.* 36, c. 14: "so that I might engage in disputation about the Scriptures and imitate their simplicity" (2, 61).

155. "Ecclesias Christi locupletissima disputatione ditavit." H. 80 (PL 57: 436 C).

156. "Patres, fidelissime disputantes," *De ten. immob.*, c. 3 (PL 121: 1091 A).

157. "Patrum sequentes sententias, disputare intendimus," *In Ap.* (590 DE, 595 D). Notker to Salomon of Constance: "they explained certain judgments of divine authority when the opportunity for their own disputation arose."

158. Peter Damian, *Ep.*, Bk. 4, 7: "When we take up offerings, we must first inquire about the merits of those who are doing the offering" (PL 144: 308 B).

159. "Dicitur Petro, Duc in altum, hoc est in profundum disputationum generationis divinae." *S.* 94 (PL 67: 721 C).

160. "in profundum disputationum et pelagus Scripturarum," *Ad Elip.*, Bk. 1, c. 2 (PL 156 ?: 895 B); Paulinus, *C. Fel.*, Bk. 1, c. 11 (99: 362 C).

161. "In this little work I have not launched my vessel into the whirling vehemence of deep disputations" (PL 202: 927-8).

162. "disputator," "investigator," Augustine, *C. Cres.*, Bk. 1, n. 21 (PL 43: 458); *Ep.* 33, n. 3 (33: 130).

163. "disputationes," Cassiodorus on Jerome, *Inst.*, c. 21, n. 1: "always eloquent, making steady progress through different kinds of disputations" (PL 70: 1135 D).

164. *L. carol.*, 3, preface: "in the present text of the book . . . while we intend to discuss the opinions of those who have posited certain positions in another way . . . we plan to enter into a disputation about faith in a certain way of our own" (PL 98: 1112 C); John of Cornwall, *Eulogium*, c. 3: "If anyone should look into that disputation more carefully . . ." (199: 1052 A); etc.

165. *C. quaed. cap. err. Ab.*, c. 5, n. 11: "straightaway, at the very beginning of his dissertation *(suae disputationis)*" (PL 182: 1062 D).

166. *Trip. tab.*, p. 3, c. 15, n. 172: "It is time now for us . . . to discuss *(disputemus)* that image of Moses" (PL 198: 777 D).

167. "by means of a verbose commentary *(disputatione)*" (PL 199: 784 B). And *Metalogicus*, 2, 15.

168. "disputare sapienter"

169. MGH, *Scr.*, 4, 547. Cf. Aponius, *In Cant.*, Bk. 5: "in that [Platonic or Stoic] disputation which agrees with divine Scriptures" (94).

170. *Tusculanae disputationes*

171. Acts 17:17; 19:8-9; 20:9. Bede, *In Act.* 17: "The order of apostolic disputation should be carefully considered" (PL 92: 979 B).

172. "disputantes cum Stephano," Acts 6:9 (Greek: συζητοῦντες [= *suzētountes*]). Also Augustine, *Doctr. chr.*, Bk. 2, c. 31, n. 48; (Combès-Farges, 312); Rufinus, *Apol.*, Bk. 2, n. 36 (21: 614 C); Sedulius Scotus, *In Rom.* (103: 34 A, 37 A); etc.

173. Rufinus, *De adult. librorum Or.* (PG 17: 625 B, 626 A).

174. "adversum philosophos disputans," PL 25: 497 B.

175. "apostolus disputator," Augustine, *C. Cresc.*, Bk. 1, c. 14, n. 17 (PL 43: 456); Sedulius Scotus (103: 34 B).

176. Jerome, *In Tit.*: "in this way he held a staunch and vigorous disputation with the Galatians and the Romans" (PL 26: 575 D); Augustine, *loc. cit.*: "Paul . . . not only disputed with keenness and acuity . . . but also in a spirit of truth . . . , so uncommonly well did he dispute. . . . the apostle's discourses defended truth and refuted falsehood. He disputed whatever he was inclined to reject, since the best way to achieve this end was through disputation." Paulinus (*Conc. For.*, c. 10): "The blessed apostle . . . discussed the puzzling riddles of the law by using the many-sided verbal tool of disputations" (99: 292 B).

177. "grandes libri de rebus mysticis disputantes," Jerome, *Ep.* 124, c. 1-3 (PL 22: 1060-9); "he disputed with a breadth of discourse"; "after such an abominable disputation," etc.

178. *Grammatica:* "It seemed right to them . . . to extract the rules of knowledge through questions and answers . . . using colloquy and disputation" (PL 101: 854 BC); Pippini . . . *disputatio cum Albino scol.* (101: 957 ff.); *Disp. puerorum* (1097 ff.).

179. *V.S. Fig.*, c. 23: "Quite often he also derived benefit from his disputations with Master Rabanus, who was linked to him by a special friendship. And again and again while he was engaged in these disputations he roused and encouraged us and himself in the presence of Rabanus. What he had in mind was the opinion of Solomon (Proverbs 1), hoping that the person who heard all this would be made even wiser in his wisdom" (PL 105: 399 A).

180. Jonas, *V. Col.*, Bk. 1, c. 28: "It turned out that . . . the man of God . . . disputed with himself about Sacred Scriptures" (MGH, *in us. schol.*, 166). Cf. Augustine, *C. Cr.*, Bk. 1, c. 15-17: "For the one who takes part in disputation discerns truth from falsehood. . . . . If, moreover, he does this clearly and concisely, they have been more wont to call him a disputant than a speaker" (PL 43: 457); *Ep.* 33, n. 3 (33: 130).

181. Alcuin, *Ep.* 101: "When as a young man I continued on to Rome and lingered for a considerable number of days in the royal papal city, a certain Jew, Julius by name, had a disputation with Master Peter . . ." (PL 100: 314 C; cf. 394 B); Abelard, *Dial. inter Phil., Jud., et Christ.*: "Behold, our disputation has led to this" (178: 1645 A). Gerhoh, *In ps. 64*, c. 15: "For this reason we gave a partial reply in our disputation and we were prepared to dispute and prove things still further" (194: 19 D).

182. *In Luc. 16:* "The Pharisees derided the Savior when he argued against the love of money" (PL 92: 532 C).

183. Augustine, *Retract.*, Bk. 1, c. 1, n. 2: "by replying to the one with whom there was a disputation . . ." (Bardy, 278); *Excerpta Vinc. Lir.*, prologue: "The first part argued against Arius or Apollinaris, while the latter part was directed more against Nestorius" (Madoz, 1930, 101).

184. Alcuin, *Adv. Fel.*, Bk. 2, c. 1 (PL 101: 145 D); c. 14 (170 A); Bk. 4, c. 1 (173 B); *Adv. Elip.*, Bk. 3, c. 1: "When . . . the vessel of our discourse escaped the turbulent waters of disputation and reached the port of free speech" (271 A).

185. "disputando contra dogmata perversa," *In Ap.*, Bk. 2, c. 2 (PL 169: 867 A).

186. "altercatio," *Altercationes chr. philosophiae* (anon., fifth century?), Bk. 2, preface: "this second disputation" (A. E. Anspach, 67).

187. "altercatio disputationis," *In Job:* "in this little verse he compressed all disputes that are contested in words" (PL 26: 674 D).

188. "acerrimus disputator," C. 3 (PL 189: 538-40).

189. *De compr. aet. sextae* (PL 96: 567 BD).

190. *Hist.*, Bk. 3, c. 56-57. Otto knew Gerbert "and had heard him disputing more than once"; a joust is organized: "No small number of scholastics as well had come together, and they waited very anxiously for the imminent case to be disputed" (MGH, *In usum sch.*, 105-6).

191. "conflictus," "certamen," "causa," and "duellum"

192. "labor syllogisticae disputationis," *Adv. J. Sc.;* on John: "that disputant" (PL 119: 120 A); Petrus Cellensis, *ep.* 73 (202: 520 A). Cf. Peter Damian, *op.* 16, c. 8: "a circle of argumentation" (145: 376 A); Gauthier de Saint-Victor, against Peter Lombard: "regarding your new and frivolous disputations" (Glorieux, 225).

193. "dialectica disputatio acuta, verum a falso distinguens," Bk. 2, c. 31 (PL 176: 766 A).

194. "disputationis disciplina" or "disputandi disciplina." Bérenger the Scholastic, *Pro P. Ab.:* "Whoever professes himself to be trained in the discipline of disputing knows that his argument is frivolous" (PL 178: 1869 B).

195. *Ep.* 13: "But it is very much worthwhile to penetrate and analyze the discipline of disputing all the sorts of questions which arise in sacred letters. Only, in this regard, the desire to quarrel and a certain childish show of deceiving one's adversary must be guarded against" (178: 353 CD).

196. "disputationes dialecticae," Abelard, *ep.*, 8 (PL 178: 269 A).

197. "disputationis argumentationes," Abelard, *Tr. de unit. et trin.* (R. Stozle [1891], 92).

198. *Micr.*, Bk. 3, c. 189 (Delhaye, 210). Cf. P. Michaut-Quantin, éd. du *Fons phil.*, 15, n. 11.

199. *Polycr.*, Bk. 5, c. 12: "in contentious disputations and scholastic declamations" (PL 199: 572 D).

200. "disputatio scolastica"

201. The "tooth of disputation" which is wedged in between "reading" ("lectio") and "preaching" ("praedicatio") can be understood equivocally as having a twofold meaning in Peter Cantor's *Verbum abbr.* (PL 205: 25 B). But it is the first meaning, that of mastication, which is to say the meditation preparatory to the preached explication, which is the author's.

Notes to Chapter One
§4. New Questions

1. E. Lesne, *H. de la propr. eccl. en Fr.*, 5, *Les écoles . . .* (1940), 642-3.

2. "litteratura perinsignis"

3. "magnum et famosum litteraturae gymnasium," *De gestis pont. angl.* (PL 179: 1459 BC); cf. *Gest. reg. angl.* (1247); Ord. Vitalis, *H. eccl.*, p. 2, Bk. 4, c. 16: "in the Church at Bec a great foundation of liberal arts and sacred reading was initiated by Lanfranc and grew splendidly with the help of Anselm" (188: 345 B). Cf. Porée, *H. de l'abb. du*

Bec, 1 (1901), 79-105. Raymonde Foreville, "L'école du Bec et le "Studium" de Canterbury aux XIe et XIIe siècles," *Bulletin philologique et historique*, 1957.

4. On the organization and transformation of the schools: Ph. Delhaye, "L'organisation scolaire au XIIe siècle," *Traditio* 5 (1947), 211-68.

5. Cf. Abelard, *Ep.* 13 (PL 178: 353).

6. G. Bardy, "La litt. patrist. des Quaest. et responsiones sur l'Ecrit. sainte," *R. bibl.* 42-43 (1932-3), 6 articles.

7. Thus Werner, *Defl.*, Bk. 2: "A sermon on the fall of the first man and the question of how he could have been flawless, if he did not have perseverance" (PL 157: 1032 A; cf. 1128-32).

8. Thus *Ep.* 164; the Emperor Charles: "you ask questions about the gospels that must be clarified by us for those in our academies" (PL 100: 428-9).

9. "inde quaestio," Aug., *In Jo.*, tr. 34, n. 4 (250, 36: 313).

10. Florus, *Absolutio cujusd. quaest.*: "Lately the question has been considered" (PL 121: 1067 B).

11. Thus PG 12: 161 A, 163 D, 328 C, 990 A, etc. The same idea without the wording: 857 DC, 859 A, 873 C.

12. "disputationes"

13. *In Cant.*, prol.: "But questions on this subject are considered by them as if they were questions proposed at a banquet. This is, I think, because they consider it a banquet of words rather than a banquet of food" (63). Cf. Macrobius, *Saturn.*, preface and Bk. 7, c. 1 (Eyssenhardt, 4, 405). In the eleventh century Gerard of Csanad will call Plato's Dialogues "Disputationes" (Morin, *RB*, 27, 518).

14. *Quaestiones conviviales*

15. This is quite often the case in *In Ez.* or *Mor.* "Such a mighty question is being asked of Blessed Job": *Mor.*, Bk. 29, c. 18, n. 34 (PL 76: 496 A).

16. Titus 3:9; Julian of Toledo (PL 96: 541 B), etc.

17. Gregory of Elvira, *Tr. Or.*: "This is a great and almost inextricable question" (97).

18. Cassiodorus, *Inst.*, c. 24: "Let us not turn with gratuitous earnestness to questions of the vainest sort" (PL 70: 1138 D).

19. Pseudo-Augustine, c. 1, n. 1: "We know that many . . . have raised useless questions about this tree. . . . To them an account must be rendered, so that they may not raise further useless questions" (PL 39: 1736-7).

20. "in elucidandis quaestionibus omnes doctores post apostolos praecellit," *In 2 Cor.* (PL 117: 661 B).

21. "simul quaeremus," *In Jo.*, tr. 20, n. 5 (250, 36: 206).

22. Augustine, *s.* 71, c. 5, n. 8: "In all of the Sacred Scriptures there is perhaps no greater question. No more difficult question is to be found. For this reason, if I can make bold to tell you something about myself, I have always shunned the annoying difficulty of this question in discussions I had with the people" (PL 38: 449).

23. William of Saint Thierry, *Spec. fidei*: "scandals to the mysteries of faith" (PL 180: 373 C; Déchanet, *Le miroir de la foi*, c. 3, p. 82).

24. Petrus Cellensis, *ep.* 175 (PL 202: 633 B).

25. "mundi hujus stulta sapientia," Prosper, *In ps. 50*: "in order to refute all the questions which they dare to employ against the providence of God" (PL 51: 277 A).

26. Walafrid Strabo, *In ps. L* (PL 114: 774 C), *Altercatio:* "All these matters are not subject to scruples, but open" (B. Blumenkranz, *RMAL*, 10, 92; tenth series).

27. Council of Sens, 1164. *Annales Reich.:* "he completely forbade all tropes and undisciplined questions in theology" (MGH, *Scr.*, 17, 471).

28. Leo, *Ep.* 82, c. 1: "now undisciplined and impious questions are raised, which some time ago the Holy Spirit of truth put an end to through his disciples, just as the devil precipitates them through hearts that are open to him" (PL 54: 918 A).

29. Origen, *In Gen.*, h. 2, n. 1-2 (22, 27); *In Ex.*, h. 5, n. 3 (187). Hilary, *De Trin.*, Bk. 12, c. 13, returns to Origen's expressions: "the tortuous questions of a rash and presumptuous philosophy" (PL 10: 444 B); Rabanus, *In Ex.* (108: 63 DC); Gumpold. Mant., *V. Venczl. ducis*, prologue (MGH, 4, 613).

30. Rabanus, *In Ez.* (PL 110: 793 A).

31. Alvarus, *Ep.* 7, n. 2: "With all my strength I ask you to demolish the questions of these pagans, who cause the mortal downfall of folk who hear them, folk, namely, who are ignorant and do not know how to sift through the texts of Sacred Scripture" (Madoz, 173).

32. "eructuosae quaestiones," Alvarus, *Indic. luminosus*, c. 20 (121: 534 C).

33. "lubricae quaestiones," "insidiosae quaestiunculae," Rupert, *Div. off.*, Bk. 3, c. 14 (PL 170: 74 A).

34. "quae antea in quaestionem numquam venerant," Rufinus, *H.E.*, Bk. 1, c. 1 (PL 21: 467 A).

35. Augustine, *Ep.* 185, c. 10, n. 47 (PL 33: 814); on the Donatists. Cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, Bk. 3, c. 15, n. 2 (PG 7: 918 BC).

36. Cassiodorus, *In ps. 54*, 16: "But he could change the manner in which he spoke . . . since, when we take it to have this meaning, we avoid the previously mentioned question" (250, 97: 493).

37. A page of Rupert's recalls Origen on this subject and presages what Saint Thomas says in the *Summa Contra Gentiles: In Lev.*, Bk. 1, c. 9 (PL 167: 753 AB).

38. "ab adversario mota quaestio, discendi exsistit occasio," Augustine, *Civ. Dei*, Bk. 16, c. 2, n. 1 (PL 41: 477).

39. Aeneas of Paris, *Adv. Graec.*, preface (PL 121: 689 B).

40. Aeneas of Paris (686 A).

41. Peter Damian (PL 145: 694 AB).

42. Guibert de Nogent, *Trop. in Os.*, Bk. 2 (PL 156: 378 A).

43. "in Ecclesiae sacramentis," Peter Damian, *Ep.* 36, c. 5 (PL 145: 693 D).

44. Augustine, *Civ. Dei*, Bk. 15, c. 27, n. 4: "They are in the habit of conducting minute and scrupulous research into the smallest little creatures" (PL 41: 475).

45. "quaestiunculae"

46. Anonymous, eighth century: "the little question addressed to me by your reverence" (PL 96: 1385 B). Questions and replies through letters: Aelred (195: 608 C); etc.

47. Hugo Burchard, letters *De limbo Patrum:* "Your discernment has laid such a weighty little question before me" (Stegmuller, *Mél. de Ghellinck*, 731).

48. PL 177: 477 B.

49. "non parvae quaestiunculae," *In Is.*, Bk. 16, to Eust.: "That is no trifling little question that you have given me" (PL 24: 547 A); Julian of Toledo, *Progn.*, preface: "Thus

this business has given rise to some little questions which . . . have not affected our mental disposition in any merely light and superficial way" (95: 455 C).

50. Augustine, *In Jo.*, tr. 46, n. 3: "in the profundity of this question" (250, 36: 339).

51. Augustine, *In Jo.*, tr. 53, n. 8 (36: 455).

52. Prudentius of Troyes, *Ad Hincm.*, c. 7 (PL 115: 984-5).

53. "sciendi cupiditas"

54. "studiorum meritum"

55. "arcana verba, quae non licet homini loqui," *Glossa, In Ex.* 9, 15, according to Origen (PL 113: 211 A).

56. Abbon of Fleury: "eager to explain the nature of the great cycle and the most obscure of the questions surrounding it" (Manitius, 2, 669).

57. Cf. John of Salisbury (PL 199: 667 C, 668 C).

58. "quaerendi studium," Origen, *Num.*, h. 13, n. 7: "A weightier question arises here and I do not know if it is appropriate etc.; however, for those who desire it . . . let us speak about a few of the many possibilities" (116-7). Rabanus (PL 108: 727 D, 113 C).

59. Gregory, *In Ez.*, Bk. 2, h. 4, n. 10: "At which point there can be a reasonable inquiry as to why . . ." (PL 76: 979 C).

60. *Ibid.*, Bk. 1, h. 8, n. 31 (76: 868 D); Bede (91: 778 D, 715 B); John Scotus, *In Jo. fr.* 1: "when a question that is not contemptible beckons" (122: 313 A); Hugh (175: 1023 C); Hélinand (212: 606 A).

61. Honorius, Bk. 12 quest. (PL 172: 1177 A).

62. Augustine, *In Jo.*, tr. 4, n. 16 (250, 36: 39-40).

63. Augustine, *In ps.* 77, n. 24 (250, 39: 1085).

64. Augustine, *Q. in Hept.*, Bk. 1, *prooem.*: "It seems right to deal with those questions that came to mind either by mentioning them briefly or even by dealing with them at length etc." (PL 34: 547).

65. "ut Scripturarum veritas elucescat," Origen, *In Ez.*, h. 4, n. 8 (PG 13: 703 A).

66. *L. carol.* 4, c. 5 (PL 98: 1195 D).

67. "homo qui veri cognoscendi desiderio carere non potest, crebris movetur quaestionibus," *Sp. de myst. Eccl.*, c. 8 (PL 177: 374 A); Hugh, *De sacram.*, Bk. 1, p. 1, c. 18: "There are indeed many things which would be capable of introducing questions to the mind about the nature of the firmament, if this human investigation were not training its attention on matters that need to be ignored rather than discussed" (176: 200 B).

68. Allocution lent by Richer, *Hist.*, Bk. 3, c. 58, to the Emperor Otto: "Quite often when we are slowly and sluggishly taking our leisure, if we are struck by someone's questions, we are soon roused to useful thought" (MGH, *Ad us. sch.*, 19, a, 106).

69. Julian of Toledo, *Progn.*, preface (PL 96: 455 C; 456 A).

70. "multas quaestiones a latere hujus rei nascuntur," Hildemar, to Pacificus (MGH, *Ep.*, 5, 357).

71. Hugh, *De sacram.*, Bk. 1, p. 3, c. 25: "On the other hand, there arises in turn another doubt, and the mind is struck by a number of things that are obscured by deep darkness. The result is a question, whereby reason asks itself how those three facets which are found in deity can be said to be persons" (PL 176: 227 A); Hugh again (933 D); William of Saint Thierry, *Sp. fid.* (180: 389 B), etc.

72. Augustine, *In ps. CXVIII. s.* 3, n. 1: Nevertheless that question was solved in

such a way as to give rise to another more difficult one" (250, 40: 1671); *In Jo.*, tr. 124, n. 1: "Look at how much the question encompasses in this gospel, and it is a question whose profundity exercises the inquiring mind to a considerable extent" (36: 680).

73. Augustine, *In Jo.*, tr. 53: "At this point another question occurs. . . . But also the matters that follow are more pressingly urgent and precipitate a more profound question. . . . Therefore, brothers, I do not have the wherewithal to plumb these depths etc." (250, 36: 453-5); Joachim of Flora, *Sup. 4 ev.*: "But again there arises a question which is different from all of them, as people suppose, and more difficult than many other questions" (169).

74. Godfrey, *Microc.*, Bk. 1, c. 5: "Certain places in Sacred Scripture make this question worse" (Delhaye, 33).

75. "Plura quaesita quam inventa, et eorum quae inventa sunt, pauciora firmata," *Retr.*, Bk. 2, c. 24, n. 1, on the numerous questions raised in *Gen. ad litt.* (PL 32: 640).

76. "nihil quaerendum *latebit*"

77. Augustine, *In Jo.*, tr. 101, n. 6 (250, 36: 594); *In ps. 104*, n. 3 (40: 1536-7).

78. Othloh, *Dial.*, c. 102 (PL 146: 74 A).

79. Origen, *In Jud.*, h. 5, n. 1: "We make the passage from questions to questions and from sacraments to sacraments" (492); *In Num.*, h. 17, n. 4 (160).

80. Cassiodorus, *Inst.*, c. 10: "Let us therefore read the Catholic masters as zealously as we can, for in setting forth their propositions they resolve the most obscure questions" (PL 70: 1123 A).

81. A theme that became classic: seeking as coming before finding, and finding, too, as coming before seeking.

82. Rabanus, *Cl. inst.*, Bk. 3, c. 32 (PL 107: 409 C).

83. "quaestiunculae Scripturarum," *Ep.* 120 and 121 (PL 22: 980-1038).

84. *Ep.* 59, to Marcella, c. 1: "You bestir us with your great questions, and while you ask questions of one whose talents are sluggish with idleness, you are teaching him at the same time" (3, 85).

85. Origen, *In Reg.*, h. 2 (PG 12: 1011-28); Claudius, *In Reg.* (PL 50: 1078-80); *L. carol.* 4, c. 27 (98: 1245); Rabanus, *De magicis art.* (110: 1100-1); John of Salisbury, *Polycr.*, Bk. 2, c. 27 (199: 462-72).

86. Origen, *In Jer.*, h. 4 (PL 25: 616 A); or: h. 17, n. 1 (PG 13: 454 A).

87. "disputatione ecclesiarum omnium ventilata," Braulio, *Ep.* 44 (Madoz, 196). Jerome had given the solution, *Q. hebr. in Gen.*: "Therefore it remains true that there is a numerical error in this matter, just as there is in a great many other instances" (PL 23: 947 AB).

88. Cassiodorus, *Inst.*, c. 8: Augustine, "writing to Simplicianus . . . dealt with sublime and carefully devised questions" (PL 70: 1121 A).

89. "quaestiones grammaticales"

90. Abbo of Fleury (PL 139: 521-34).

91. Augustine, *Ep.* 102, q. 6, n. 30-2 (PL 33: 382-3); cf. *In ps. 52*, n. 5 (250, 39: 641-2); *s.* 66, n. 4 (38: 432).

92. *S.* 71, n. 1: "There has been an important question proposed about a recent reading of the Gospel" (38: 445); *S.* 127, n. 3: "Witness how that question about such an important matter already throws us into confusion. The result is that we cannot explicate the question in words. Who can explicate the matter?" (38: 708); *S.* 133, n. 1:

"and it is no small question" (737); *Ep.* 120, c. 3, n. 13: "taking into account such a great and difficult question" (33: 458); Esperaindeo to Alvarus (*Ep.* 8, n. 1; Madoz, 174).

93. Rabanus, *In Ex.*: "We should not immediately and impetuously enter into the furthest reaches of a question" (PL 108: 45 A).

94. Jerome, *In Is.*, Bk. 8, c. 26: "How it is that the dead have no perception of life seems to be a difficult question" (PL 24: 299 B).

95. *In Ez.*, Bk. 2, h. 8, n. 8 and 10: "Often, moreover, they are in the habit of framing an objection by recourse to a silly little question, saying: a wolf has eaten a man's flesh, a lion has devoured the wolf, etc." "Well now, in talking about the resurrection of the flesh, we have digressed somewhat from the planned order of our discourse. Let us therefore return to the ideas that we started off with" (PL 76: 1032 CD, 1034 B).

96. Otto, *Chron.*, Bk. 4, prol. (MGH, *Scr.*, 20, 193).

97. "As we are disturbed by many questions, we have become more reluctant in our reading" (PL 178: 378 C); etc.

98. Gerhoh, *In ps.*: "when the confusion and the questions have been cleared up" (PL 193: 1609 B); Gontier the Cistercian, *De orat.*, Bk. 2, c. 1: "There are some, however, who have put an end to the confusion engendered by this question" (212: 119 B).

99. Ambrose, *In Luc.*, Bk. 10, n. 147-8 (Tissot, SC, 52, 205); Augustine, *De Scr. s. Spec.*, preface: "Any number of these things will seem to be mutually contradictory, and then when questions have been posed, they will be found to be susceptible to explanation and solution" (PL 34: 889); etc.

100. "tam diversa, ut sibi invicem adversa," Ph. of Harv., *Ep.* 1 (PL 203, 1: BC); etc.

101. "diversa sed non adversa." Cf. Henri de Lubac, "A propos de la formule 'Diversi sed non adversi,'" *Mél. J. Lebreton*, *RSR*, 39-40, 27-40.

102. "diverso stylo, non diversa fide," Augustine, *De Trin.* (PL 42: 823). Rabanus, *De laud. s. cr.* (107, 165 A).

103. "diversis modis, non diverso Spiritu," Bernard, *De laud. V. Matris*, s. 2, n. 11: "Without a doubt the Spirit of the prophets was one and the same, and, different as they all were from one another, they foresaw and predicted one and the same thing. Although they did this in different ways, with different signs, and at different times, it was not done with a different Spirit" (PL 183: 66 C); etc.

104. "nodosas quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti denodare," Hugh Metel., *Ep.* 51 (404); *Ep.* 47: "to seek prudently . . . , to knit questions together strongly, . . . to disentangle those that have been knit together ingeniously" (398); Autpertus, *In Ap.*, Bk. 5: "as far as we are concerned, a confused question arises, one that is most difficult and knotty to disentangle" (516 F).

105. P. de Labriolle, *La réaction païenne*, 487-508. Later example: Julian of Toledo, *Antikeimenôn*, Bk. 1: "Questions from the Old Testament that seem to be in disagreement" (PL 96: 595 A; cf. 632 C, 675 B, etc.).

106. Origen, *In Matt. ser.*, 126: "You also ask whether . . . the evangelists are not in mutual disagreement with one another" (263); etc. Cf. Honorius, *In Prov.* (PL 172: 326 AB).

107. Richard, *Expl. aliq. passuum difficilium Apostoli* (PL 665-84), "If the things which are said in various places by the Apostle about the law are compared with each other, it would seem that there are many discrepancies in these accounts" (665 A).

108. Julian of Toledo, *op. cit.*: "Surely it was a stimulus to our questioning" (PL 96: 668 C). Cf. Isidore, *L. de var. q.*, c. 6 (20); preface (1).

109. "Haec sibi in verbis suis non discrepant, sed ad requirenda haec quasi discordantia studium nostrae mentis inflammatur." *Ibid.*, Bk. 2 (675 D).

110. John of Salisbury, *Ep.* 169: "It is these words of Ambrose that provoke the question" (PL 199: 162 C); etc.

111. Isaac of Stella, *s.* 16 (PL 194: 1741 C). Augustine, *In ps. 150*, n. 7: "For even then the saints of God will have their differences, differences that are in harmony with one another, not discordant, which is to say that they are consistent with one another, not at variance. Just as the sweetest of harmonies springs up from sounds which are diverse, but which do not, however, clash with one another . . ." (250, 40: 2195-6). Hugh Metel, *ep.* 20 (352); William of Saint Thierry (180: 359 A); etc.

112. Hincmar, *Capitula presbyteris data:* "the apostolic see does not oppose itself or clash with itself, even as the sentences of the gospel are not in disagreement with one another" (PL 125: 792 CD).

113. Alan of Lille, *De planctu naturae:* "in most respects we conceive of them as diverse, not as clashing with one another" (PL 200: 446 A).

114. Rupert: "questions are wont to be mooted" (PL 170: 366 A); etc.

115. William of Malmesbury, *Gesta reg. angl.*, Bk. 2, n. 122, on the work of John Scotus: "in order to solve quite usefully the perplexity of necessary and unavoidable questions" (Th.D. Hardy [1840], 190); Ordericus Vitalis, *H. eccl.*, p. 3, Bk. 10, c. 2: "since . . . a great number of perplexing questions about the faith . . . had been raised by the Greeks" (PL 188: 722 D).

116. Remi, *In Gen.* (PL 131: 83 A); Richard (196: 258 A); etc. "In the minds of many a question arises" (Cf. O.L., BTAM, 3, 559).

117. "Quaeritur," "quaeri potest," "non immerito quaeritur," "quaerat nunc forte aliquis," "solet quaeri," "oritur quaestio," "quaestio animum pulsat" . . .

118. "Quaeritur iterum," "altior hic exoritur quaestio," "etiam alia nobis quaestio oboritur"

119. "Quaerendum," "quaeramus," "restat quaerendum," "est adhuc quod quaeramus," "manet nihilominus quaestio"

120. Hugh, *Ep.* 2: "The heat of your charity has brought a weight of questions on us" (PL 176: 1011 C). "A necessary enough question," Peter Lombard will say in *I Sent.*, d. 4, n. 1 (192: 533 B).

121. Ambrose (PL 14: 322 C, 397 A, 413 D, 416 A); Augustine, *In Jo.*, tr. 45, n. 6: "These are edifices that are full of questions, pregnant with sacramental significance" (250, 36: 391); etc.; Isidore: *Mysticorum expositiones sacramentorum seu Quaestiones in V. T.* [= *Expositions of the Mystic Sacraments or Questions on the Old Testament*] (PL 83: 107-424). Cf. *Corpus mysticum*, 2d edition, 258-62.

122. Paschasius, *De fide*, c. 1: "First there must be a seeking . . . ; I do not say that faith must be sought, but rather prayed for" (PL 120: 1389 CD).

123. "petendo, quaerendo, pulsando," Augustine, *In ps. 138* (several times). Helinand, *S.* 15 (PL 212: 598 A).

124. Odorannus, *opusc.* 7: "stimulated by the fact that you pose delightful questions" (PL 142: 813 B).

125. Augustine, *In Jo.*, tr. 99, n. 2: "A difficult question, exceedingly difficult; would that the Spirit himself were at hand" (250, 36: 583).

126. Petrus Cellensis, *S.* 66 (PL 202: 846 BC).

127. Petrus Cellensis, *S.* 94 (922 D).

128. Petrus Cellensis, *Ep.*, 175 (633 B).

129. "se in Deum et Deum in se quaerere," Petrus Cellensis, *De afflict. et lectione:* "Here the human heart is able to possess itself, since all questions have been compressed into one question, and having discarded things that are foreign to it, the heart takes care of its own proper affairs. Greatly significant indeed is that one question, which is not insoluble, if it is coupled with a constant and eager searching, a seeking of self in God and God in self . . ." (Leclercq, 238).

130. ". . . ut ipsa admiratio magnam gigneret quaestionem, et magna quaestio ad perscrutandum magnum mysterium studium piae mentis erigeret, pie vero scrutans mens hominis altitudinem prophetiae velut homo piscem Dominum Christum de profundo Scripturarum levaret."

131. "hodierni dialectici," "adulterino sensu domum Dei vexant," Hugh Metel, *Ep.* 40 (385).

132. "quaerunt dialectici," Alger of Liège (PL 180: 809 D); Othlo, *Dial.*, prol. (146: 60 A, 62 B).

133. "locum quaestionis inveniunt ubique . . . ," John of Salisbury, *Metal.*, Bk. 2, c. 10 on his master Alberic of Rheims: "He found an occasion for questions everywhere" (Webb, 81). Cf. *Corpus mysticum*, 254-8; Chenu, *Le théol. c. science au XIIIe siècle*, 3d ed., 28.

134. "vera Scripturarum scientia"

135. "studium lectionis," "humilitas cordis." Cf. Cassian, *Coll.* 14, c. 10 (Pichery, SC, 54, 195).

136. Rupert, *In Gen.*, Bk. 2, c. 20 (PL 167: 265 B).

137. Reference in Ghellinck, *Mouvement*, 95-6. On the praise of dialectic in Augustine and in Isidore: Fontaine, 616-8. Since the time of Alcuin: Lesne, 5, 599-605.

138. J. de Ghellinck, *Sacra pagina*, Mél. Pelzer (1947), 40.

139. *Paul Claudel interroge l'Apoc.* (1952), 42.

140. Bruno of Segni: "Like a scorpion shaking its tail they turn to dialectical questions" (PL 165: 563 B).

141. Hugh, *De inst. novit.*, c. 8: "When it comes to lectio divina, you should be more inclined to seek what builds up morals for the practice of virtue than what sharpens the understanding to the point of refinement. And you should wish rather to be informed by the precepts of the Scriptures than to be ensnared by questions" (PL 176: 933 D). Texts like these, however, do not condemn all scientific research in exegesis or theology: what is being discussed here is the formation of novices. Cf. above, Chapter 1.1, n. 188.

142. Florus, *Adv. J. Sc.*, c. 2 and 19 (PL 119: 120 A, 247 C, 248 B); William, *Disp. adv. Ab.*, c. 7 (180: 270 C). *Disp. alt.* (321 CD).

143. Gerhoh, *Ep. ad Eberhardum:* "I am readily wary of foolish and undisciplined questions which the Apostle admonishes us to shun. And so it is against my will that I confer with undisciplined and foolish disputants about complicated matters" (PL 194: 1065 B), etc.; Ans. d'Hav., *Dial.*, Bk. 1, c. 1: "Since they are idle, such people introduce questions and pervert the hearts of the simple" (188: 1142 C; but what is at issue here is a practical problem); "and they disturb certain folk with numerous questions" (1143 A).

144. H. de Marcy, *De peregr. civ. Dei*, tr. 17 (PL 204: 386 C).

145. Arno de Reich, *L. c. Folmar.:* "He presumes to deny that God is the Father of the manhood assumed by the Word. By way of argument, he refers to that philosopher who supposes that nothing sensible can arise from what is insensible. For if this

argument from the world of nature is admitted into the realm of theology, faith is emptied and made void" (PL 194: 1533 C).

146. "naturalis facultas," Otto, *Gesta Frid. imp.*, Bk. 1, c. 41, on Abelard: "While he understands the significance of names in terms of the natural faculties, he has carelessly introduced this into theology" (MGH, *Scr.*, 20, 377).

147. Peter Damian, *Op.*, 36, c. 5: "Clearly these notions arise from the arguments of dialecticians and rhetoricians. They are not easily adaptable to the mysteries of divine virtue. The reason they have been devised is so that they may be of use in the construction of syllogisms or closing summaries. They ought not to be stubbornly introduced into the realm of sacred laws, where they place the necessities of their own conclusions in opposition to divine virtue" (PL 145: 603 C).

148. Rupert, *De vol. Dei*, c. 5: "Certain scruples of the more inquisitive who prattle that God wishes evil" (PL 170: 440 A).

149. These are the expressions of Louis Bouyer in *Du prot. à l'Église*, 175.

150. William of St. James of Liège (Leclercq, *AHDMLA*, 18, 94).

151. Bernard, *Ep.* 189, n. 4: "a discussion of the proofs of faith is entrusted to petty, little human arguments" (PL 182: 355 C).

152. Nic. of Clairv., *In nativ.*, s. 2, n. 7: "And the one who sets the boundaries on everything is not bound by dialectical limits" (PL 184: 837 D).

153. Leclercq, *L'amour des lettres*, 191-9. I have borrowed the last three citations from him.

154. Ernest Renan (still a believer) to his sister Henriette, 27 November 1843 (*Lettres intimes*, 4th ed., 152).

155. "disciplina disciplinarum," Rabanus, *Cl. inst.*, Bk. 3, c. 20 (PL 107: 197 C); following Cassiodorus, *De art.* (70: 1167 D) and first of all Macrobius, *Saturn.*, 7, 15, 14.

156. "contentiosae scholasticorum quaestiones," PL 100: 184 B.

157. *L. de trib. epist.*, c. 1 (PL 121: 988 C); *De tenenda*, c. 2 (1085 CD); c. 9 (1109-10).

158. *Adv. Graec. praef.*, citing 2 Tim. 10:22 (PL 121: 689 AB).

159. *L. de corp. et sang. Dom.*, c. 7: "God is my witness, as is my conscience, that in dealing with divine letters it was not my wish to propose dialectical questions or their solutions or even to respond to dialectical questions that had been proposed" (PL 150: 417 A).

160. *Ep.* 36, *De div. omnip.*, c. 5 (PL: 145: 603 C). On the thought of Peter Damian there is an excellent overview by J. Gonsette, S.J., *S. P. Damien et la cult. profane* (1956), c. 2 (on dialectic and sacred science) and c. 3 (on omnipotence and its problems), 43-101. Peter Damian discards a dialectic which, by introducing necessity everywhere, suppresses the action of God in the world. In the century that follows, William of Saint Thierry and others will end up discarding, in particular, a dialectic that claims to explain all of God's being in itself. The first of these alternatives is especially desirous of salvaging the possibility of miracles. The second is intended to bring about a respect for mystery.

161. Hermann, *De fest. abb. S. Mart.* (PL 180: 42 C).

162. "Probae et bene compositae mentis non est, hujusmodi movere et agitare quaestiones." *De vol. Dei*, c. 6 (PL 170: 440 D).

163. "amica intentione, non ut contendat, sed ut aliquantula ex parte cognoscere mereatur veritatem divini judicii," "quaestiones multiplicat magis contendendi studio quam discendi," *In Ap.*, Bk. 11, c. 20 (PL 169: 1180 CD).

164. "nova nunc temeraria novitate dogmaticat," *De omnip. Dei*, c. 2 (PL 170: 456 B).

165. *De consid.*, Bk. 5, c. 3, n. 6: "Confusion is wholly to be guarded against in these matters. This is to avoid faith lending a fixity to the uncertainty of opinion or else opinion calling into question what is firm and fixed in the realm of faith" (PL 182: 790 D).

166. Geoffrey of Aux., *Libellus c. capit. Gilb. Pict.*, n. 1 and 2 (PL 185: 595 CD).

167. Both of them are, in the main, severe on account of his attitude to Gilbert. According to Radevin, Otto's successor, Otto, as he lay dying, would have asked for his text to be corrected if it was found to be too favorable to Gilbert (*Gesta Frid.*, 4, 14; Waitz, 252). John hoped to see the two adversaries reconciled in heaven in full view of the truth: *H. pont.*, c. 9-11.

168. "quaestiones scrupulosas et plenas scandalis," "homo dialecticus," *Disp.*, c. 3 (PL 180: 257 B, 266 D, 281 A). Poor Abelard will write (*Hist. calamit.*, c. 9): "Inasmuch as those questions seemed preeminently difficult, the greater and weightier they were, the greater the subtlety of their solution was thought to be" (178: 143-4).

169. "molestiae quaestionum," *Exp. in Ep. ad Rom. prol.*: "when the annoying questions that are in it were suppressed"; "we have taken up the Letter to the Romans, which is enveloped with a great variety of quite difficult questions" (130: 547 A).

170. The author seems to be a Benedictine abbot writing at the behest of Hugh of Rouen.

171. PL 180: 310 C, 328 D. Cf. 338 B, citing Ambrose.

172. *De gl. et hon. Filii hom.*, ep. dedic. (PL 174: 1074 A).

173. *Liber de novitatibus hujus temporis*, *L. de lite*, 3, 288-306.

174. "Non quiescit serpens antiquus."

175. "indisciplinatas quaestiones in theologia," *Ep.* 21 (PL 193: 576 B, 584 B). On this episode: Ghellinck, *Mouvement*, 252, 257.

176. *Ep.* 1: "Without a doubt that question, which you say that you found in a certain little book . . . is not difficult to broach, nor should it disturb anyone, since a quick explanation suffices to remove its little snares" (PL 203: 14 CD); *Ep.* 2: "Somehow you seem . . . to be exaggerating the weight of the question . . . in order to shed light on the tangled confusion of the question . . . ." (16 C).

177. *Ep.* 6 (203: 16 D).

178. *C. 4 labyr.*: "Where then are the great perplexities and the doubt-ridden questions of faith on which he says that Catholics differ?" He is indignant about what he calls "scholastic frivolousness" (Glorieux, 255, 201, 275).

179. *Ep.* 73: "O blessed school, where Christ teaches our hearts with his virtuous words. . . . No book needs to be purchased there, no master of writing needs to be hired, there are no fraudulent disputations, no entangling sophistries. There is a clear conclusion to all questions, there is full and complete understanding of all reasons and arguments" (PL 202: 520 A).

180. *De disc. claustr.*, c. 4 (PL 202: 1107 B).

181. Cf. *L'essor*, 1, 194.

182. "Tu autem, fili, non quaestionem quaeris, sed devotionem." *De Jesu duod.*, n. 2 (A. Hoate, SC, 60, 68).

183. *In ps. 54*, 24 (PL 191: 516 A).

184. "temeritas quaestionum," *Verb. abbr.*, c. 4, On the foolhardiness of questions and foolhardy disputations (PL 205: 31 B).

185. "sacra pagina"

186. A. Landgraf, *Th. Rev.* (1955), 350; Leclercq, 192-3.

187. "versutias inanium quaestionum," "quaestionum minutias," "superfluas et inutiles quaestiones"

188. "Deponamus igitur quaestiunculas inutiles, ne dlutius cum Judaeis videamus montem Seir multiplici et vano circuitu circuire, et tam diu in Ramesse pervagando, ad terram promissionis, id est ad veritatem theologiae, nequeuntes pervenire." *V. abbr.* c. 3, On the brevity and aptness of questions (PL 205: 29 A, 30 D); "as we languish in useless and superfluous questions, we grow weak" (31 A).

189. "ut ignorantiae suae omnes socios habeant, nolunt eos aliquid inquirere, sed ut rusticos nos credere, nec rationem quaerere," G. de Conches, *Philos. mundi*, Bk. 1, c. 23 (PL 172: 56 B).

190. G. de Hirschau, *Praef. in sua astronomia:* "Since they maintain that for us monks nothing is permitted in the way of liberal science except for the psalter" (Pez, VI, 261).

191. "Fides non habet meritum, cui humana ratio praebet experimentum." Abelard's commentary *In Rom.*: "These days there are those who are not apt to give reasons, since they maintain falsely that faith should be discussed as little as possible, proposing as they do that saying of Gregory's to excuse their incapacity . . ." (Landgraf, 18; cf. Greg, *In ev.*, Bk. 2, h. 26, n. 1: PL 76: 1197 C). These are the words that Bernard had used in his opposition to Abelard, *Tr. de error. Abael.*, c. 1, n. 1 (182: 1055 B).

Notes to Chapter One
§ 5. Theology of the Four Senses

1. As does A. J. Macdonald in *Authority and Reason in the Early Middle Ages* (1933).

2. J. Cottiaux, *RHE*, 30, 655.

3. "dialectica, bene disputandi scientia"

4. "dialectici moderni," "nefanda temeritas," "insipiens superbia"

5. "in altissimas de fide quaestiones assurgere," *De fide Trin.*, c. 2 (PL 158: 263-5); c. 3: "He is one of those modern dialecticians who believe that nothing exists except what they can comprehend by dint of their imaginations" (271 A). Already we have the wise distinctions of Lanfranc, *In Col.* 2, 3: "in the heights, that is, in the loftiness of words and syllogisms and other kinds of disputations. He does not disparage the practice of disputation, but rather the perverse customs of those who engage in disputation" (150: 323 B); cf. *In 1 Cor.* 1 (157 B).

6. "qui mentes hominum inflat et in jactantiam elevat," *In Cant.* (PL 172: 361 D, 422 B).

7. Chenu, *Théol. au XIIe siècle*, 185; *Intr. à l'ét. de S. Th. d'Aquin*, c. 2 and 9.

8. "quaestiones Scripturarum," Bede (PL 91: 716 A). Braulio, *Ep.* 5: "I had questions about the divine and sacred pages" (Madoz, 84).

9. "quaestiones sacrarum litterarum," *Ep. Hel. ad P. Ab.* (PL 178: 327 B). Cf. Pseudo-Hugh, *Quaest. et decisiones in Ep. Pauli* (175: 431 ff.).

10. "sacrae paginae quaestiones," Anselm, *De fide Trin.*, c. 2 (PL 158: 265 A; cf. 261 A).

11. "quaestiones de sacra pagina," title of a work by Robert of Melun (around 1145).

12. "disputabilia sacrae paginae," "in seriem," "in ordinem," *Sent.*, prol.: "Therefore, by rendering serially everything on the sacred page that is open to dispute, so as to provide for those who are approaching it for the first time, we are putting disordered things in order, reviving long-established notions through sober inquiry, and providing explanations to difficult problems" (Moore-Dulong, 1). In the same vein once again we have the *Quaestiones* of Odo of Soissons (around 1164). Cf. Lesne, vol. 5, 657-76.

13. It is a similar case in his liturgical commentary: Bk. 11 of the *De div. off.* is "On the Trinity."

14. "de caritate"

15. *Sententiae*

16. "quaestiones"

17. "quaestiones Scripturae"

18. *Init.* (J. A. Robinson, 1).

19. *Sententiae divinae paginae*

20. *Sententiae in sacram paginam*

21. Ghellinck, *Mouvement*, 33, 114-5; J. Chatillon, *RMAL* (1953), 6: "the frontier between the two genres often remains imprecise." Cf. Paré, 270-4. G. Warichez, *Les "Disputationes" de Simon de Tournai* (1932).

22. "irridentes dicebant sero me ad studium venisse artis dialecticae," *De omn. Dei*, c. 23 (PL 170: 473 B). After having defended himself on the enemy's ground, he replies: "To be sure, I consider the simple words of shepherds and fishermen, to whom God has spoken, to be more valid than the arguments of philosophers and wise men, whom God has allowed to be misled by false meanings" (473 C).

23. J. Leclercq, "Le comm. du Cant. attribué à Anselme de Laon," *RTAM* 16 (1949), 29. Cf. O. Lottin, *RTAM* 14, 156-64; E. Lesne, *H. de la propr. eccl. en Fr.*, 5, 643.

24. "Lex, evangelium, psalmus, seu nube voluta,
Anselmo mediante, Deus dedit esse soluta."

PL 171: 1722 B.

25. "dialecticarum rationum armatus praetuli," *H. cal., Ep.*, 1, 1 (PL 178: 113). Cf. Dom Tosti (1851).

26. "effrenes indomiti circatores," *Th. chr.*, Bk. 3 (PL 178: 1215 D, 1218 C, 1219 C).

27. Sigebert's Chronicle, *Continuatio praemonstr.*, a. 1140 (PL 160: 372 C).

28. "de divinitate"

29. *H. cal.*, c. 2-5 (PL 178: 122-6).

30. "Cum autem de divina Scriptura non minorem mihi gratiam quam in saeculari Dominus contulisse videretur . . . ," c. 8 (138-9).

31. "magistros divinorum librorum," *Intr. ad. th.*, Bk. 2, c. 5 (178: 1056 B).

32. "Cujus quidem intelligentia ita omnium alimentorum et deliciarum copiis exuberat, ut sola ipsa triplici expositione perfectionem teneat doctrinae." *Th. chr.*, Bk. 2 (178: 1210 AB). Gilbert de la Porée's funeral oration will also be remembered as a fact of language, at the very least: first of all a great philosopher, "he then betook himself to a study of 'lectio divina' etc. He was supremely competent in the realms of both human and divine letters etc." Leclercq, *AHDLMA*, 19, 184.

33. Ph. Delhaye, *L'organis. scolaire au XIIe siècle*, 241-6.

34. *Doctr. chr.*, Bk. 4, c. 20-21 (C.-F., 489-519).

35. Bk. 3, c. 27-38: "But because we have already said a fair bit about how to go about discovering what is to be learned from the Scriptures, we shall, God willing, say very little about communicating what has been learned. That way, we can close the whole work with this last book" (PL 107: 406 BC).

36. Othlo of Saint Blaise on Peter Comestor: "With marvelous refinement he wrote a book of sermons in which, besides doing other useful things, he inculcated morality in the minds of mortal men in a marvelous way" (PL 198: 1046 B).

37. P. Michaut-Quantin, edition of *Fons philosophiae*, introduction, 9.

38. "Si . . . videremus istum taliter scientia saeculari doctum, sapientia divinae Scripturae peritissimum, doctum sc. in Veteri et Novo Testamento, historia, allegoria, tropologia, anagoge, litteratum triplici sermone sicut Hieronymum; in ratiocinatione disertum sicut Augustinum; in moralitate sicut Gregorium; sapientem denique sicut Salomonem: omnibus modis proclamaremus: Magnus iste." *Serm. cent.*, 10 (PL 177: 920 C). Cf. Macrobius on Virgil: *Saturn.*, Bk. 5, c. 1 (Eyssenhardt, 247-50).

39. P. of Poitiers and Garnier of Rochefort, *Distinctiones in psalterium;* Peter Cantor, *Exp. in psalt.;* Prévostin, *Summa sup. psalt.;* etc.

40. St. d'Irsay, *H. des universités* 1 (1933), 53-97; H. Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (1927), 368-97; E. Lesne, vol. 5, 224-67; L. Halphen, *A Trav. l'h. du m. âge*, (1950), 286-98.

41. "omnium mitissima et civilissima nationum," John of Salisbury, in 1167 (Denifle and Chatelain, *Chartul. univ. paris.*, 1, 18-9).

42. "Paris = paradise": referred to in J. Leclercq, *La sp. de P. de Celle*, 93.

43. John of Salisbury, in 1164 (*Chartul.*, 1, 21); William of Breton, *Philippide*, 1, 101: "you have come to be the instructress of the whole world" (*HLF*, 17, 121).

44. "Non leguntur hic poetae,
Sed Joannes et prophetae . . ."

Cited by E. de Bruyne, 2, 164.

45. "Hic florent artes, caelestis pagina regnat,
Stant leges, lucet jus, medicina viget."

Wright, 453.

46. In 1208 or 1209: *Chartul.*, 1, 67-8.

47. "In hac insula perpetuam sibi mansionem pepigere sorores, artes videlicet liberales, et intonante nobilioris eloquentiae tuba, decreta leguntur et leges."

48. 4. 2. 1254: *Chartul.*, 1, 252.

49. "Hic fons doctrinae salutaris exuberat, et quasi tres rivos ex se limpidissimos ad prata mentium irriganda producens, dividit tripliciter intellectum sacrae paginae spiritalem, in historicum, allegoricum et moralem." *Chartul.*, 2, 56. It will be seen in what follows that the omission of one of the four terms is of no consequence. As matter to be taught, anagogy was attached to allegory. On the other hand, the tripartite division is occasioned here by the parallelism with the division into three Faculties (arts, law, and theology).

50. Alberic's Chronicle alludes to this bombastic style: "Guido moves forward in his own way, with an elevated Gallic style" (cited in *H. litt. de la Fr.*, 16, 449). On Guy: Raby, *Secular Latin Poetry*, 2, 28-42.

51. "verborum strepitus et disputationum anfractus"

52. *Ep.* 80 and 111 (PL 211: 376 AC, 400 B).

53. "Novas recentesque summulas et commentaria firmantia super theologia passim conscribunt." *Ep.* 251 (211, 514), between 1188 and 1203. In Desilve, *Lettres d'Et. de T.* (1891), *Ep.* 284 (344-6).

54. "lectores ebrii, scholastico potius quam theologico vino ultra modum potati," *De gloria et hon.* (PL 194: 1074-5).

55. *Register* of Gregory IX (Auvray, 1 [1896], 118-9).

56. "Quamvis autem principalis occupatio studii theologorum deberet esse circa textum suum, sciendum est . . . quod a quinquaginta annis theologi principaliter occupati sunt circa quaestiones, quod patet omnibus per tractatus et summas, et onera equorum a multis composita, non sic circa sacratissimum textum Dei; propter quod proniores sunt theologi ad recipiendum de quaestionibus quam de textu." *Comp. studii theol.* (Raschall, 1911), 34; in Chenu, *Théologie comme science au XIIIe siècle,* 3d ed., 27, note. The "textus" here is the Bible.

57. *Chartul.*, 1, 473.

58. Cf. Chenu, *loc. cit.*

59. "Potest autem sacra scientia dividi tripliciter, sc. secundum materiam vel subjectum; secundum multitudinem sensuum, et secundum distinctionem partium vel librorum; et quadruplici divisione dividitur secundum quodlibet istorum trium. Est enim 'fluvius qui egreditur de loco voluptatis, qui inde dividitur in quatuor capita'. Nam in divino eloquio agitur de giro quadruplici, secundum differentiam sensuum quadruplicem; quia, sicut dicit prima Glossa super Genesim: Quatuor sunt sacrae Scripturae regulae sive sensus, id est, historia . . . , allegoria . . . , tropologia . . . , anagogia. . . . His quatuor rotis, tota divina Scriptura volvitur." *AHDLMA* 13, 318, 321.

60. "sacra scientia" or "sacra doctrina"

61. "sacra pagina" or "theologica pagina." P. Lombard, *In psalmos,* praef.: "the whole theological page" (PL 191: 57 B).

62. "Among other questions which have been raised by doctors of Sacred Scripture" (Leclercq, *AHDLMA* 14, 167).

63. "Omnes qui erunt ibi, erunt magistri theologiae et legent in magna biblia, sc. in libro vitae divino." *De conscientia* (P. Chambon [1903], 2).

64. Leclercq, *B. thomiste,* 7 (1943), 67.

65. Chenu, *op. cit.*, 509-10.

Notes to Chapter Two
§ 1. "Marvelous Depths"

1. "mira profunditas"

2. M. Gandillac, in *Blaise Pascal, entretiens de Royaumont* (1956), 322.

3. Jonah of Orleans, *Inst. laic. praef.* (PL 106: 124 A); Paulinus, *Libellus sacrosyll. c. Elip.*, c. 7 (99: 158 A). Cf. Gregory, *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, h. 5, n. 1 (76: 821 B); Peter Damian, *op.* 2 (145: 42 C); Manegold (93: 624 D).

4. "infinita sensuum silva," Jerome, *Ep.* 64, c. 21 (3, 135); Origen, *In Ez.*, h. 4: "the exceedingly broad forest of Scripture" (359); Peter Damian: "Carry on in your journey through the woods of divine eloquence" (PL 145: 42 C).

5. Gregory, *In I Reg. proem.*, n. 2 (PL 79: 19 AC); n. 4: "as we go about our labors in such enormous depths, as if we were in a huge sea" (21 A).

6. Richard, *Lib. except.*, P. 2, Bk. 7, c. 23 (J. Châtillon, 331); Peter Comestor, s. 42: "Sacred Scripture is a table of riches, on which our Savior, to the depths of whose riches there is no end, has provided us with a plenitude of dainty dishes" (PL 198: 1822 B); Petrus Cellensis, *Mos. tab. mystica et mor. expos.*, Bk. 2: "It is as impossible to explain the delights of this table as it is to swallow the whole expanse of the deep sea" (202: 1075 A). Cf. Origen, *In Num.*, h. 27, n. 1 (257); *In Matt.*, ser. 100 (218); *In Cant.*, Bk. 3 (186), etc.

7. John of Salisbury, *Polycr.*, Bk. 7, c. 12 (PL 199: 666 A); Augustine, *In ps. 143*, n. 1: "the weight of the mysterious" (250, 40: 2072).

8. Jerome, *In Ez.*, Bk. 14, *praef.* : "the ocean of Scriptures and, if I may say so, the labyrinth of God's mysteries" (PL 25: 448 D).

9. Autpertus, *In Ap.*, Bk. 9 (613 B). Honorius, *In ps. 32*, 7 (PL 193: 1324 C); Pseudo-Aimon, *In ps. 116* (543 C, 686 CD); Rupert, *In Ap.*, Bk. 4, c. 7 (169: 956 D); Godfrey of Admont, *H. 12 in Script.* (174: 1112 D); etc.

10. Ambrose (PL 16: 738 C, 880 AB); Gregory, *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, h. 6, n. 13 (76: 834-5); Ninth Celtic catechesis: "a vast sea that is deep and broad, namely, Divine Scripture" (Wilmart, 83); Ermenric, *Ep. ad Grim.*, c. 24 (MGH, *Ep.* 5, 561); Berengoz (PL 160: 1001 C).

11. Cf. Origen, *In Gen.*, h. 9, n. 1: "it is just like someone embarking on a small vessel in order to sail the sea. . . . A great and dreadful fear grips his spirit, since he has committed his small craft to the huge waves. It is something like this that we too seem to undergo . . . when we dare to embark on so vast a sea of mystery" (86).

12. Origen, *In Ex.*, h. 9, n. 1: "If anyone has a good notion of Paul's meaning, he is well aware of what a great ocean of understanding it has laid open to us" (235).

13. "Scriptura sacra, morem rapidissimi fluminis tenens, sic humanarum mentium profunda replet, ut semper exundet; sic haurientes satiat ut inexhausta permaneat. Profluunt ex ea spiritualium sensuum gurgites abundantes, et transeuntibus aliis, alia surgunt; immo, non transeuntibus, quia sapientia immortalis est; sed, emergentibus et decorem suum ostendentibus aliis, alii non deficientibus succedunt sed manentes subsequuntur; ut unusquisque pro modo capacitatis suae in ea reperiat unde se copiose reficiat et aliis unde se fortiter exercent derelinquat . . . ," *In Cant. prol.* (Leclercq, *St. ans.*, 20, 225).

14. Jerome, *In Is.*, Bk. 6: "Which seems as simple and easy in the way it is worded as it is deep in the majesty of its meanings" (PL 24: 866 D).

15. Origen, *In Ex.*, h. 12, n. 1: "Lectio . . . which would inspire us to search for understanding" (262); *In Lev.*, h. 3, n. 8: "I feel that explaining the greatness of the mysteries is beyond our strength. But although we cannot discuss and research everything, we do, however, feel that everything is full of mystery" (413-4). Other texts in HE, 138-9 and 334.

16. Othloh, *De trib. quaest.*, c. 2: "All divine things should be investigated in a manner which presupposes that no one can speak of them or effect them worthily and perfectly" (PL 133: 63 D); c. 33 (101-2).

17. Primasius, *In Ap.*, Bk. 2, following Job 11: "the divine law, which contains the secrets of infinite wisdom, ought to be explained 'multipliciter' [= 'in a multitude of ways']" (PL 68: 819 C).

18. Origen, *In Num.*, h. 9, n. 7: "we shall be able to lay open and investigate that ineffable goodness of God's which is always hidden in the letter of Scripture, since we see that this goodness is more ample and bountiful in its actuality than in terms merely of its pronuse" (64-5).

19. Cf. Alcuin, *Ep.* 163: "The language of God is visible to the eye and is capable of being penetrated everywhere. The depths of God's mysteries are profound. Who could investigate all the secrets of these mysteries?" (PL 100: 424 A).

20. Gregory, *In Ez.*, Bk. 2, h. 5, n. 3: "To be sure, all of Scripture is written on our account, but not all of it is understood by us" (PL 76: 986 C). N. 4: "For there are some things which speak of heavenly matters in such a way that they are accessible only to those celestial citizens who are fixed steadfastly in their homeland. But these things have not yet been laid open to us wayfarers" (986 C).

21. Autpertus, *In Ap.*, Bk. 10: "And thus even these heavenly spaces are revealed in our presence. But even so, it turns out that things are hidden in the upper waters of the heavens. This is because certain facets of sacred eloquence become clear to us precisely because the spirit opens them up to us, while certain things that can be detected only by the angels are kept hidden from us yet" (658 H).

22. "Quis ita est capax Spiritus Dei, ut haec sacramenta dilucidet?" Origen, *In Ez.*, h. 1, n. 2 (PG 13: 276 D).

23. Adam Scotus, s. 2, c. 6: "For it is just as if we were using our hands to grab hold of some closed chest. We sense from its bulk and weight that many things lie hidden inside it, although we are quite ignorant of what they are, since everything that has been placed inside it is closed off. This is the way it often is when we are dealing with the sacred sentences that are to be found in the divine pages of Scripture. We conjecture from the pregnant words on these pages that profound and mystic sacraments lie hidden in them, although as yet we cannot use the unveiled eyes of our mind to see what lies inside the words themselves" (PL 198: 160 A).

24. "mysteriorum immensitate extenditur," Irimbert, *In Ruth prol.* (Pez, 4, 444).

25. Rabanus, *In Ez.*, Bk. 15: "To be sure, Sacred Scripture is written on our account etc. (cf. n. 20 above). Indeed, many things in it are so open that they provide nourishment to little ones. Certain parts have more veiled sentences, sentences such as to put the stout-hearted through their paces and which are more gratifying insofar as it takes more work to understand them. Some things in Scripture, moreover, are so closed and impenetrable that, while we do not understand them, owing to our weakness and blindness, we find them to be of more profit to our sense of humility than to our understanding" (PL 110: 910-1).

26. Rabanus, *In Jos.*: "although we cannot lay open the depths in these areas, at least it will not be problematic to touch on all the most profound issues. In this way, everyone who hears this will get the opportunity to pursue a higher, mystic knowledge" (PL 108: 1094 A).

27. *H. in Prol. Jo.*: "Therefore the Eternal Light declares itself to the world in two ways, namely, Scripture and creation" (PL 122: 289 C).

28. *In Jo.*, fr. 3: "It is beautiful how the disciples are asked to make the people sit down, because if the masters of truth had not first begun teaching those whom they had nourished in the lowliest of places, as it were, in the literal simplicity of visible creation, they would not have been able to raise them up to the heights of contemplation. To be sure, the first step in scaling the heights of virtue is the letter of Holy Scripture, and the appearance of visible things, so that, once the letter has been read or creation examined, they may ascend, with the steps of right reason, to the spirit of the letter and the rationality of creation" (122: 342 B). "The simple throng of the faithful is sated and contented by the letter alone, by visible creation, and also by visible symbols; the masters of the Church are asked to gather up the spiritual understandings inherent in the letter, creation, and the symbols, as if they were a scattering of left-over fragments, which those who are carnal are not yet capable of gathering up" (343 AB).

29. *Div. nat.*, Bk. 3, c. 35 (122: 725 D).

30. *Sup. Hier. cael. S. Dionysii*, Bk. 2: "And if I may speak briefly, all the appearances of visible and invisible creation, and all allegories, either in word or deed, throughout both Testaments of Sacred Scripture, are the garments that cover the father's radiance, and his own radiance in the flesh is the best covering garment for his deity and is connatural to us" (122: 136 C); *In Jo.*, fr. 1: "The Word has two feet, one of which is the natural rationality of the visible creation and the other of which is the spiritual understanding of Divine Scripture. One of them is covered by the sensible forms of the sensible world. The other is covered by the highest heights of the divine, that is to say, the Scriptures . . ." (307 B).

31. *Sup. Hier. cael.*, Bk. 3: ". . . visible forms that he contemplates either in the nature of things or in the most holy sacraments of Divine Scripture, forms that were not made for their own sakes, nor sought for their own sakes nor made known to us. Rather these forms are the images of invisible Beauty. Through them Divine Providence recalls human minds to the pure and invisible beauty of Truth itself, which any loving thing loves and towards which any loving thing tends, either knowingly or unknowingly" (122: 138; cf. 723).

32. *Ibid.*, Bk. 2, 1: "For the human mind was not made on account of Divine Scripture, which it would not have needed at all, if it had not sinned" (146 C). On the symbolism of John Scotus, for whom everything is theophany: E. de Bruyne, 1, 339-70.

33. *Ibid.*, 1, 2: "For what is simpler than the Word of God, seeing that everything that can be pondered is pondered through him in his Father to the extent that he allows them to be pondered? What is more manifold than this same Word, seeing that he is diffused throughout all the things that were made in him and through him, and he is portioned out in a whole variety of ways to those who have a strong understanding, so as to allow them to savor him?" (134 BC). "Although the divine radiance does not abandon its own proper simplicity and its own singular unity, it is, however, beautifully multiplied and advances on to the things that have been foreseen, with a view to

combining them properly in a unified, anagogical way and bringing about that conjunction which leads on high and unifies everything" (134-5).

34. "in ea tamen simplicitate multiplex continetur theoria," *In Jo.*, fr. 3 (341 B).

35. *Sup. Hier. cael.*, 3, 2: "the varied contemplations of Sacred Scripture"; ". . . our mind, which by its transgression has abandoned understanding of the divine, is led back again to this same understanding through the variety and many-sidedness of the contemplation of Sacred Scripture . . ." (183 A).

36. *Div. nat.*, Bk. 4, c. 5: "For there is a manifold and infinite understanding of divine eloquence. Take, for example, the case of the peacock's feathers. One single marvelously beautiful collection of numberless colors can be seen in one single spot, and this comprises just a small portion of this same peacock's feathers" (749 C).

37. *Inst.*, c. 4: "The Psalter . . . , if I may say so, is a kind of peacock, exceedingly beautiful, and is conveyed to the eyes, as it were, by a dazzling and manifold variety of colors" (PL 70: 1115 CD). Alan of Lille applied this image to the style of Sidonius: *Anticlaud.*, Bk. 3, c. 3 (110: 513 C).

38. *Div. nat.*, Bk. 2, c. 20: "The interpretation of Sacred Scripture is infinite" (560 A); Bk. 3, c. 24: "Since the infinite author of Sacred Scripture in the minds of the prophets, namely, the Holy Spirit, established an infinite range of understandings in it" (690 BC); c. 26: "so long as there is a multiple interpretation of divine eloquence" (696 A).

39. *Sup. Hier. cael* 2, 1: "Just as poetic art, using fictional stories and allegorical likenesses, constructs a moral or natural teaching in order to train the human mind . . . so it is that a certain theological poetry, as it were, shapes Sacred Scripture with fictional fancies. This poetic approach hones our minds and restores them by recourse to our physical, exterior senses, so that we move, as it were, from a kind of imperfect childhood to the perfect knowledge of intelligible things, to a kind of mature, great age, as it were, of the interior man. . . . On account of the human mind, Sacred Scripture is intertwined with different symbols and teachings, so that through the good offices of Scripture our rational nature, which by its transgressions has lapsed from its contemplation of truth, might once again be led back to the pristine heights of pure contemplation" (146 BC).

40. *Div. nat.*, Bk. 2, c. 16 (548-9); cf. c. 15 (545-8).

41. *In Cant.*, h. 2, n. 9: "diverse in its variety of understandings, one with respect to what underlies it" (54), etc. Cf. HE, 140.

42. The texts are quite numerous.

43. *In ps. 118*, 4, n. 1: "manifold understanding" (390). Cf. Chromatius, *In Matt.*, tr. 5, c. 5, n. 2: "which is a manifold spiritual understanding" (250: 9, 408-9).

44. On 22 September 1452 Nicholas of Cusa wrote as follows to Gaspard Aindorffer: "The inexplicable fecundity of Divine Scripture is diversely explained by diverse writers, so that its infinity might shine forth variously in a great number of ways; there is, however, only one divine word that sheds its light on everything" (E. Vansteenberghe, *Autour de la docte ignor.* [1915], 3).

45. *In Cant.*, *s.* 51, n. 4: "thus there will not be merely one theological discussion arising from the matter, if it produces diverse understandings that need to be accommodated to the diverse necessities and dispositions of souls" (PL 183: 1027 AB); *s.* 31, n. 1: what a great number of times the Word has changed its appearance . . . (940 CD).

46. Thus Gerhoh (PL 193: 735-6). Cf. William of Auvergne, *De legibus*, c. 16: Scripture is "a banquet of understanding"; "thus the numerous and various understandings and expositions inherent in God's eloquent sayings are as great as is needed by the numer-

ous and various people who need to be refreshed and reinvigorated. For this reason, anything that can be eaten or quaffed from this source by any of the banqueters is totally suitable for you" (*Op. omnia* [1674], 1, 472).

47. "Sacratissimorum sensuum exuberat arcanis." *Libri car.*, 1, c. 15 (PL 98: 1036 D).

48. Bk. 4, c. 1, n. 7 (303).

49. "condita," "confecta." Thus Augustine, *In ps. 8*, n. 7 (250, 33: 52); Rupert, *In Ex.*, Bk. 2, c. 1 (PL 167: 607 CD); *In Ez.*, Bk. 2, c. 3: "The (Word) himself is the architect and maker of the world, and he also . . . composed . . . Sacred Scripture" (1465 A).

50. Apringius, *In Ap.*, c. 5 (Vega, 30).

51. *Didasc.*, Bk. 7, c. 4 (PL 176: 814 B); Gerhoh, *In Ps. 140*, 16: "Creation is a mirror, Sacred Scripture is a riddle" (193: 1456 D); Alan of Lille: "Every creature in the world — like a book and a picture — is also a mirror for us" (210: 579 A); Al. Neckam, *De nat. rer.*, Bk. 2, prol.: "Thus the world is inscribed with the pen of God, for anyone who understands it, it is a literary work, etc." (125). Whence, we get, as Baudelaire says, "the inexhaustible fund of universal analogy"; he quotes the following words: "nature is nothing but a dictionary" (*Curiosités esthéthiques* [1921 edition], 270).

52. Richard (?), *In Nahum* (PL 96: 723 B).

53. "velut quoddam evangelium corporale et visibile," *Lib. mel.*, c. 3 (PL 190: 1355 CD).

54. "quasi quaedam sit lectio menti nostrae, species considerata creaturae," *Mor.*, Bk. 26, c. 12, n. 18 (PL 76: 359 A).

55. "dum vestem colunt, contemnunt Vestitum," *S. ined.* 10, *in annunt.* (Talbot, 86).

56. "lex" and "mundus"

57. S. 10, *de nat. Dom.* (PL 205: 610 AB).

58. Peter Lombard, *Prol. in ep. Pauli* (Engelberg manuscript): "if the mind of man had not been darkened by sin, he would have a clear and excellent notion of the Creator without any support from Scripture" (Leclercq, *Misc. Lombardiana*, 3). Cf. Thomassin, *Traité de l'off. divin*, P. 1, c. 17, n. 3: "There was no book of Scripture in existence yet, and there was not even any need for it, seeing that the world was a book that was sufficiently great and splendid and luminous" (1686, 300-1).

59. "magna fabrica mundi . . . magno labore et difficultate ac diuturna operatione," Augustine, *In ps. 103*, *s.* 1, n. 7 (250, 40: 1479).

60. Augustine, *In ps. 8*, n. 7-9 (250, 18: 52-3); *In ps. 103*, *s.* 1 (40: 1473-92); *Conf.*, Bk. 13, c. 15, n. 16 (2, 378); Rupert, *In Gen.*, Bk. 8, c. 18 (PL 167: 505 A); Bonaventure, *Brevil.*, Bk. 2, c. 12 (*Quar.*, 5, 230); etc.

61. *Misc.*, Bk. 1, tit. 83: "If anyone should say that all of creation is a theophany, he would not be in error" (PL 177: 518 B).

62. "Scriptura explicat quae creatura probat." *Misc.*, Bk. 1, tit. 63 (177: 505 A).

63. Cf. Basil, *In ps. 44* (PG 29: 408 C).

64. *Hier. cael.*, c. 2, n. s: cf. 1, n. 2 (SC 58: 74-5, 71-2).

65. "tunica polymita," Rupert, *In Gen.*, Bk. 8, c. 20 (PL 167: 507 AB; cf. 513 C).

66. *In Ez.*, Bk. 2, h. 4, n. 19 (PL 76: 983 D).

67. *In Sam.*, Bk. 3, c. 6 (PL 91: 628 B).

68. *Quaest. et resp.* (PL 172: 315 CD).

69. *In Jud.*, Bk. 1 (Pez, 4, 218).

70. *S.* 16: "Truly it is many-shaped . . ." (PL 194: 1741 A).

71. "Fons aethereae de margine scaturiens"

72. Bk. 2, c. 30: "the more there is drawn from it, the less is it depleted, and the more it is diverted into many channels, the more ample is the burgeoning growth of the meanings that it takes on" (PL 98: 1106 B). Cf. Augustine, *Conf.*, Bk. 12, c. 27, n. 37 (2, 357).

73. "Latissimi sensus, spatia Scripturae divinae," *In Cant.*, Bk. 4 (70).

74. "Nosti enim quod sacrae verba Scripturae, cum semel et bis vindemiata sunt, ac si gravida sacris iterum soleant influere sensibus et quasi prius tacta non essent, ubertem et inebriantem effundant expressa liquorem." *Prol. in Matt.* (Leclercq, *Studies* 15 [1953], 103).

75. *In 1 Reg.*, proem., n. 3: "To be sure, Sacred Scripture, because it is divinely inspired, surpasses the minds of distinguished men to the same extent that these distinguished men are themselves inferior to God, and they see none of its spiritual sublimity unless it is revealed to them by God's goodness" (PL 79: 19 D).

76. *Spiritual Canticle,* preface.

77. *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine,* 2, sect. 1, n. 14.

78. "Non enim sine causa multiplex Spiritus a sapiente describitur, nisi quod sub uno litterae cortice diversos plerumque sapientiae intellectus tegere consuevit." *In Cant., s.* 47, n. 4 (PL 183: 1009 C).

79. "capax innumerabilium sententiarum," *S. de oner.*, 2 (PL 195: 364 A).

80. "praeclara ingenia multorum multipliciter exercebuntur," *In Ap.*, c. 10 (PL 169: 1011 B); Alvarus, *Indic. lum.*, n. 31: "the many-sided meaning does not hinder Catholic teaching, and frequently Sacred Scripture points out many things with a solitary phrase or figure of speech" (121: 550 C); John of Salisbury, *Polycr.*, Bk. 7, c. 12: "For even though the superficial aspect of the letters is fitted to only one sense, a multiplicity of mysteries lies within" (199: 666 B).

81. "diversitas sententiarum in profundo caelestium litterarum," Irimbert, *In Jud.*, 7, 12 (Pez, 4, 264).

82. Origen, *In Cant.*, Bk. 3 (174, 204); 1.4 (227); *In Matt.*, vol. 12, c. 36 (152); etc.; Isidore, *Sent.*, Bk. 1, c. 18, n. 1-6 (PL 83: 576-7), etc.; Ambrose, *In Luc.*, Bk. 7, n. 12: "the Word either lessens or grows according to your capabilities" (Tissot, SC, 52, 12); etc. In the work of Origen this eclecticism is linked to a profound teaching about the incarnate Word; cf. *In Cant.*, Bk. 1 (104); Bk. 2: "Through each and every sense, each and every thing is revealed to the soul as Christ" (167); *In Jo.*, Bk. 1, c. 9 (14-5); *In Matt. ser.* c. (218); *In Num.*, h. 27, n. 1 (257); etc.

83. *In ps. 67,* n. 15: "although that sense does not bear such an overwhelming force of necessity that none other would be acceptable" (250, 39: 878), etc. Cf. M. Pontret, *L'exégèse de St. Aug. prédicateur,* 135-48.

84. *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, h. 10, n. 14 (PL 76: 891 B); *Ep.*, Bk. 3, 62: "To achieve an understanding of Sacred Scripture, one does not have to reject anything that does not oppose a sound faith. For just as it happens that from one lump of gold there are some who fashion necklaces, others rings, and still others ornamental bracelets, so from one science of Sacred Scripture all of its interpreters gather up various ornamental embellishments, as it were, by way of innumerable understandings of the text. All of these ornamental embellishments add to the beauty of the celestial bride" (*Gr. Reg.*, 1, 223).

85. "non ex altera intelligentia impeditur altera," Origen, *In ps.* (PG 12).

86. ". . . ideoque nullius expositoris sensus sensum alterius aufert, dummodo ut

sanae fidei catholicaeque professioni conveniat, quod quisque dicat." *De div. nat.*, Bk. 3, c. 24 (PL 122: 690 BC).

87. "Vere multiformis est, cum sit tamen simplicissima, Dei Sapientia, et cum sit uniformiter una, multipliciter tamen multiplex invenitur. . . .

Unde possibile factu saepe est, in eadem Scriptura dissentientes vel diversa sentientes, Spiritu sancto posse optime convenire, vel consentire, dum a fide veritatis et aedificatione caritatis ac subversione cupiditatis, quibus omnis oculus Scripturae sanctae invigilat, constiterit non dissentire. Nam et unusquilibet de eodem aliter atque aliter, alias atque alias, nec tamen alio atque alio Spiritu sentit, dum utrobique, ut dictum est, veritati caritatique consentit." *S.* 16 (PL 194: 1741-2); Dungal, *Adv. Claud.* (105: 483 D); etc.

88. "Divina Scriptura plerisque in locis varios intellectus, quorum nullus dignus est reprobari, quamvis alter altero possit amplius approbari." *Ep.* 1 (PL 203: 2 BC); Bernard, *In Cant., s.* 2, n. 4: "I think that what is being said is pleasing to you; but be willing to accept another meaning" (183: 791 AB).

89. "Duo Testamenta murenulae dicuntur, quia in diversos modos expositionum flecti possunt, multis involuta sententiis, tantum ut nihil fidei contrarium sonent." *In Cant.* (PL 195: 1076 C). Cf. Bossuet, *Expl. de l'Ap. Préf.*: "Who does not know that the boundless fecundity of Scripture is not always exhausted by a single meaning?"

90. "in fieri"

91. "in facto esse"

92. "Non enim fecit (Deus), atque abiit; sed ex illo in illo sunt." *Confessions*, Bk. 4, c. 12, n. 18 (1, 79).

93. "Spiritus sancti miraculo fecundata," Anselm, *De concord.*, q. 3, c. 6 (PL 157: 528 B).

94. Origen, *De princ.*, Bk. 4, c. 1, n. 7: "The divine inspiration . . . of Holy Scripture, which extends throughout the whole length and breadth of it" (303-4); n. 1: "It seems necessary first to show that the Scriptures themselves are divine, that is to say, inspired by the Spirit of God" (293).

95. "Mira profunditas eloquiorum tuorum. . . . Mira profunditas, Deus meus, mira profunditas!" Augustine, *Conf.*, Bk. 12, c. 14, n. 17 (2, 340); *In ps. 118, proem.*: "For the more open it seems, the deeper it stikes me as being, so much so that I could not even begin to demonstrate how deep it is. There are other matters that are difficult to understand. But even though their meaning may be shrouded in obscurity, their obscurity, however, is itself readily apparent. But not so the obscurity that obtains in this case, precisely because its surface appearance is such as to lead one to suppose that what is needed is merely someone to read it and hear it, not someone to expound and interpret it" (250, 40: 1664-5); *Gen. litt.*, Bk. 5, c. 3, n. 6: "Sacred Scripture has a way of speaking that laughs the proud to scorn with its loftiness, that holds those who are attentive to it with its depths, that feeds the great with its truth, and that nourishes the small and humble with its courteous politeness" (34: 323); Gregory, *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, h. 5, n. 1 (76: 821 BC); *Mor., ep., miss.*, c. 4 (75: 515 A), etc. We need to return to this idea, which is a profound one, albeit one-sided in its inspiration at times.

Notes to Chapter Two
§2. Multiple Meanings

1. "multiplex et multimoda locutio Litterarum sacrarum," Augustine, *De Trin.*, Bk. 2, n. 1 (Mellet-Camelot, 182).

2. "multiplicitatem sensuum Scripturae augere se discrepant," *De insp. s. Script.* (1906), 138.

3. "spiritalem intelligentiam" and "mysticum sensum"

4. "historicam lectionem," *In Ps. praef.*, c. 14 (250, 97: 17).

5. "historaliter, allegorice, mystice" or "moraliter," *In Nahum*, n. 15: "At present Nineveh can be understood in four ways: historically, as that renowned metropolis of the Assyrian kingdom, allegorically as specifying the world, mystically as a type of the Church, morally in its role of soul" (PL 96: 715 AB); cf. n. 72 (740 CD). A manuscript commentary on Genesis yields the sequence: "historically, spiritually, morally, mystically" (ninth century; Bischoff, *S. Er.*, 6, 231).

6. N. 48: "We have spoken of these matters historically; now let us refer them to the Church" (729 A); n. 60 (734 B).

7. N. 84, on 1, 1: "Let it be said of the Assyrian, then of the soul, then of Christ, and lastly of the Church" (751 C).

8. *In Gen.*, Bk. 3: "Also, he received five robes, that is to say, in terms of the law, the many-sided discipline of wisdom and of all the senses" (PL 50: 1029 D).

9. "heroico metro"

10. "Quem opere stromateo tripliciter digessi, ad litteram, allegorice, mythologice." *L. de script. eccl.*, c. 171 (PL 160: 588 A).

11. "Latet hic intelligentia generalis, specialis, finalis."

12. *S. in f. S. Petri* (PL 171: 666 B).

13. "Est unumquodque eorum aequivocum ad multa. Dicitur enim quandoque emphatice, quandoque antonomastice, quandoque specifice, quandoque allegorice, quandoque anagogice, quandoque tropologice. Emphatice, id est expressive, dicitur Christus. . . . Specifice, Virgo Maria. . . . Allegorice, generalem significat Ecclesiam. . . . Anagogice . . . caelestis Ecclesia figuratur. . . . Tropologice, totus homo. . . ." *S. 37, in ded. Eccl.* (PL 205: 807-8).

14. Martin of León, *In Ap.*, 19, 1: "for this reason we ought to praise him antonomastically, that is to say, to the heights" (PL 209: 395 B).

15. *S. de humilitate, in cena Dom.*: "Let us conclude, therefore, by way of epilogue, that there is one Christ who has gone forth from God through an eternal begetting, and he makes his way back through a breathing of the spirit. Secondly, through his assumption of humanity he makes his way back by way of contemplation. After the literal, theological, and metaphysical sense, it still remains for us to carry over our theme, especially the first part of it, to the area of our morals as well, and say that the soul's moral going forth from God can happen in two ways: this going forth can be evil and most reprehensible through pride or else it can be the highest of goods through humility" (*Op. omnia*, du Pin, 3, 1126). On this sermon: A. Coombes, *Essai sur la critique de Ruysbroeck par Gerson*, 3, 194-260.

16. Revelation 5:1: "And I saw in the right hand of him who was seated on the throne a scroll written within and on the back, sealed with seven seals, etc."

17. *Gregory the Great*, 2 (1905), 309.

18. *Speculum* 4 (1929), 287-8.

19. *The Study*, 41-2.

20. *Esquisse*, 24.

21. "Some Early Mediaeval Commentaries on the Old Testament," *HTR* 46 (1953), 30, n. 4: "Angelome may have borrowed the number seven from Tyconius by way of Augustine, but there is otherwise no similarity between his seven senses and Tyconius."

22. Origen, *In Jo.*, Bk. 5, c. 6 (103); Gregory, *Dial.*, Bk. 4 (PL 77: 400-1). On this sense of Revelation 5:9-14, see Crouze, "Le dogme de la Rédemption dans l'Ap." BLE, 1957, 72-3.

23. "Duo Testamenta, per quae singuli judicandi sunt," *In Malach.*, c. 3 (PL 119: 292 A). Cf. Origen, *Schol. in Ap.* 27 (*TU*, 38, 3, 33).

24. "Septem sigillis agnus innocens modis
Signata miris jussa disserit patris."

P. lat. aevi car., 3, 249.

25. Berengaud, *In Ap.*, v. 3 (PL 17: 809 CD); etc.; Peter Damian, *Ep.*, Bk. 8, 10 (144: 483 D).

26. Thus Gregory, *Dial., loc. cit.*; *In Ez.*, Bk. 2, h. 4, n. 19 (PL 76: 983 D).

27. Thus Alcuin, *De septem sig.* (PL 101: 1169-70).

28. *Tr. in Ap.*: "Its seven signs are: his incarnation . . . , his birth . . . , his passion . . . , his death . . . , his resurrection . . . , his glory . . . , his reign. Thus, while he was fulfilling everything through his manhood, Christ opened up and unsealed all these things which Scripture had closed and sealed shut" (Vega, 1941, 31).

29. *L. de cogn. bapt.*, c. 19: Christ "opens the mysteries of his incarnation to the hearts of believers"; the person who is baptized "will behold that open book which is stamped with holy authority, and which, when it was wrapped in mystery by the seven seals, was opened up by the same Lion of the tribe of Judah. This book, consisting of all of Holy Scripture, has been opened, because the knowledge of it is revealed by Christ, who alone, in his desire to fulfill them, took onto himself the things that he had ordained and foreknew as needing to be fulfilled for the salvation of humankind"; "there are seven signs of it: the first is the incarnation, the second is the nativity, the third is the passion, the fourth is his death, the fifth is the resurrection, the sixth his glory, the seventh his reign. This disclosure of signs is the full redemption of humankind" (PL 96: 119-20; the author may be Justinian of Valence).

30. *Ad Elip.*, c. 1, c. 13: the same list (PL 96: 964 B).

31. Alcuin: birth, baptism, cross, sepulchre, resurrection, ascension, judgment (PL 101: 1169-70).

32. Incarnation, birth, passion, resurrection, ascension, judgment, reign (144: 483 B).

33. "But what do we understand by the seven signs if not Christ's birth, passion, resurrection, ascension, baptism, judgment, and recompense according to merit?" (PL 165: 626 C).

34. "Incarnation, birth, passion, descent into hell, resurrection, ascension, coming to judge" (in St. Thomas, *Vivès*, 31, 528; cf. 32, 161).

35. In Apringius's list Dom M. Férotin saw an "evident allusion" to the Mozarabic Rite, following the consecration: "the priest broke the host into nine pieces, which he laid out on the paten in the form of a cross, applying to each of them the title of one

of the mysteries of the life of the Lord" (edition of Apringius [1900], 32). In effect, the order is the same on all counts, except that in the rite there are an additional two mysteries: circumcision and service.

36. "septem Christi mysteria," "septem sacramenta nostrae redemptionis, in lege figurata et a prophetis praedicta," Rupert (PL 169: 925 D); Pseudo-Thomas, *Exp. in Ap.* (528).

37. Thus Garnier of R., *s.* 6: "The lamb . . . came to remove the seven seals from the book; since he consented to be born, since he chose to be submissive, to suffer our passions without sin, to be tempted, to fast, to die, and to vex the underworld, not without cause should we, who see all these things clearly and openly, make time for reading" (PL 205: 609 BC).

38. Cf. Rupert, *In Ap.*, Bk. 3, c. 4 and Bk. 4, c. 6 (PL 169: 912 AB, 940 BD); *In Cant.*, Bk. 4 (168: 879 C).

39. "Et septem quidem signacula sic sibi cohaerent, ut qui unum novit, nihil de aliis dubitet. . . . Septem ergo sigilla, septem sunt mysteria, in quibus fides nostra principaliter continetur." *In Ap.*, Bk. 2, c. 6 (PL 165: 633 C).

40. "septem illa sacramenta, quibus utique totus ordo dominicae dispensationis impletur" (PL 144: 483 B). In c. 9 of his *De fabrica mundi* Victorius of Pettau had written: "Christ also fulfilled his humanity using the number seven: his birth, his infancy, his childhood, his adolescence, his youth, his mature age, his death" (Haussleiter, 8).

41. "fides incarnationis dominicae cum omnibus sacramentis suis." Cf. Hel. of Froidmont, *s.* 1 and 8 (PL 212: 484 A, 542 D).

42. *In Ap.*, Bk. 2 (PL 68: 824 C).

43. *In Ap.*, Bk. 3, c. 5 (PL 100: 1120 C). Thus Sedulius Scottus loved to find the most curious kinds of syllogisms in Saint Paul: *In Rom.* (103: 33 C, 34 AC). Then there was someone like Cassiodorus, who was in the habit, even that early on, of finding the rarest rhetorical and logical figures in the psalms: *In ps. 24*, 14 (70: 175 C).

44. *In Ap.*, Bk. II (PL 117: 1014 AB). (The author may be Remi.)

45. "modi locutionis . . . modi verborum . . . quos etiam ipsi mundani auctores in suis dictionibus animadvertere potuerunt," Autpertus, *In Ap.*, Bk. 3 (470 C).

46. *De disc. claustr.*, c. 18: "That book is written on both the outside and the inside, lest, even though your lips be silent, you contemplate iniquity as you lie on your bed, that is to say, in the secret places of your heart. . . . There are also seven seals . . . : considerations of tranquillity, considerations of profession, considerations of keeping the peace, considerations of allaying the affections and emotions of the heart, considerations of drawing away from secular affairs, considerations of examining the law of God, considerations of contemplation" (PL 202: 1125 AB). On the number seven in Scripture: *L. de panibus*, c. 14 (992-3).

47. The seven ages of the interior man (Primasius: 68: 827-9); the week, "in which the world was created" (Apringius, 30); the seven miracles of which the Eucharist is comprised, the seven virtues beneath which "seven beatitudes lie hidden" (Pseudo-Thomas, 520). . . .

48. Absalon, *s.* 25: today the book is open; "For what else but seals of a sort were those ventures of the patriarchs, the angelic servants, the sacrificial victims, the suggestive revelations, all of which prefigured Christ in action or in likeness. If to these you add the obscurities of the Scriptures, the deferral of the promise, the desperateness

with which truth sought fulfillment, you will find a total of seven seals" (PL 211: 149 D).

49. Thus Berengaud (PL 17: 812 B).

50. Thus Bede, *In Ap.*, Bk. 1, c. 5 (PL 93: 146 D); *Ep. ad Eus.* (129-34); Pseudo-Thomas, 538-40: "the many-sided situation of the Church."

51. Augustine, *In Job*, c. 38, n. 32: "It is a time of unfolding . . . when the Lord will come and illuminate the secret things that lie enshrouded by shadows etc."; cf. 1 Cor. 4:5; Col. 3:4 (PL 34: 878); Bonav., *In Hexaem.*, coll. 20, n. 15: "The figures have not yet been explained; but when the moon is full, then there will be an unfolding of the Scriptures, and the book will be opened, and the seven seals that have not yet been opened will be unbound" (Q., 5, 428).

52. Cassiodorus, *Complexiones in Ap.*: "That [book] was seen to be sealed with seven seals, that is to say, with the sevenfold Spirit; because the mysteries of the Lord are still regarded as being unknown even to the predetermined time" (PL 70: 1409 A). Cf. Primasius (corrected version), *Exp. in Ap.*, h. 4: "Sealed with seven seals, that is to say, hidden with the full force of all the mysteries, because it remained sealed even until the passion and resurrection of Christ" (35, 3422).

53. Revelation 4:5; 5:6.

54. Paschasius, *In Lam.*, Bk. 2: "Nor is there any doubt but that the Holy Fathers, no, rather the Holy Spirit, imparted mystic understandings to that sevenfold number" (PL 120: 1106 A); Bede (93: 145 A); Aimon, *In Ap.*: "By the seven seals we should understand the fulness and obscurity of the mysteries that lay hidden in the Old Testament; or else the sevenfold number refers to the sevenfold Holy Spirit, because evidently all of Scripture is given and disclosed by the grace of the same Spirit" (117: 1013-4); Apringius, *In Ap.*, c. 1: "One Spirit . . . , sevenfold in his virtues" (3).

55. Apringius (9).

56. "a nullo nascitur, nec generat nec generatur," Isidore, *L. numerorum*, c. 8 (PL 83: 186 A).

57. "sacramentum cujusdam universitatis"

58. Augustine, *In ps. 86*, n. 4 (250, 39: 1201); etc. Primasius, Bk. 4: "for with the number seven he wished to show . . . universality" (889 C); Bk. 5: "oftentimes universality is signified by the number seven" (922 D); Isidore (83: 186 BC); Berengaud, v. 3: "For indeed by seven horns all of the elect are designated . . . , of whom we have divided . . . the whole multitude . . . into seven parts" (17: 809 B); Aimon, *In Ap.*, Bk. 5: "By the seven angels . . . are understood all preachers, because the number seven is posited by way of denoting universality; they have seven regions, that is to say, the fulness of doctrine" (117: 1122 C); Gerhoh: "The number seven is wont to signify universality" (193: 861 D); Peter Lombard, *In ps. 11* (191: 157 B); etc.

59. *Mor.*, Bk. 3, c. 26, n. 50 (PL 75: 624 B); Bk. 35, c. 8, n. 16-8, 76 (758-60); *In ev.*, h. 33, n. 1 (1239 C); Alcuin (100: 526 A); Honorius, *In Prov.* (172: 324-5); etc.

60. "tam apud saeculares philosophos quam apud ecclesiasticos," *In Ap.*, Bk. 4 (PL 169: 967 C); cf. *In Cant.*, Bk. 4 (168: 897 A).

61. Geoffrey Babion: "The number seven pertains to universality on account of the seven days that fill up universal time. For this reason, the gifts of the Holy Spirit are said to be seven in number, not only because there are indeed seven, but because, through their being seven in number, all the gifts in their universality are understood" (J. P. Bonnes, *RB*, 61, 184, n. 2). From the time of Augustine on, these views were

standard. Cf. Augustine, *In ps. 160*, n. 1: "The Holy Spirit is entrusted to the number seven" (*CCL*, 40: 2191).

62. "signatum signis septem, multifaria mysteriorum latitantium plenitudine tectum," Primasius, Bk. 2 (PL 68: 821 B); Bede (93: 145 A); Alcuin (100: 1120 B); Aimon (117: 1013 D); Rupert: "the book sealed with seven seals, that is to say, a book with a text that is hidden and veiled by all the fulness of the mysteries, a text that was even written under the direction of the sevenfold Spirit" (167: 1682 B; cf. 169: 925 CD).

63. *Dial.*, Bk. 4, c. 42 (PL 77: 400-1).

64. Thus Gerhoh, *In ps.* (PL 193: 1611 B); M. of Leon, *In Ap.* (209: 329 C).

65. "Arbitror tamen septem modos tanquam septem signa in Scripturis divinis exercitiis palam debere quaeri." *In Ap.*, Bk. 2 (PL 68: 821 B).

66. "Praemissos enim locutionis modos, etsi congruum utcumque videtur, ad illud tamen quod quaerimus exiguum judicatur." *Ibid.* (822-3).

67. "Inquirentibus itaque nobis Scripturam, primus historiae actionis textus occurrit; secundus, allegoriae gestus; tertius utriusque modus agnoscitur; quartus, de incommutabili divinae Trinitatis essentia, quando proprie, quando tropice sacris insinuetur; quintus, parabolorum, quia tam relatu quam actu conficitur, ut quando aliud dicitur, et scripto aliud inveritur, ad pastum spiritalis intelligentiae animus erigatur; sextus, de gemino Salvatoris adventu, vel ad eos pertinentia (sic), ne aut primus pro secundo, qui secundus intelligatur pro primo, ubi grandi intentione regula discretionis est adhibenda. Hinc enim et Judaeorum mentes adveniente Domino caligabant et nunc usque eadem ignorantiae caecitate laborant, in tantum ut nonnumquam de ipsis quoque peccatis hominum et transgressionibus aliquorum prophetia praetendatur operum futurorum, aut secreta spiritalium sensuum. Ille porro modus, id est septimus, quo sic divinis praeceptis instruimur, ut certa vitae agendae forma, aliis vero vitae significandae figura regulariter innotescat, sollicita intentione tractandus est, in his et quid foris scriptum, et quid intus sit discrete cognoscitur." *Ibid.* (822 BC).

68. *Ibid.*: "But now it is right for us to use examples in order to teach about the preceding modes" (823-6). He does not explicate one and the same text in different ways, but for each "mode" he gives a different text. Primasius goes on to conduct a search among these "modes," seeking out "which of them should be considered from within and which from without" (827 BD); then he parallels them with the seven ages of the inward man as they were distinguished by Augustine (827-9), and he concludes that everything remains a mystery: "For this is the way they are. They are saving bodies of knowledge, and their secrets, which are imbedded in the sacred volumes and lie hidden in the guise of those seven modes that are like seven signs, are veiled over by shadows . . ." (829 D).

69. M. Gómez, *El perdido comentario de Ticonio . . .*, *Misc. biblica B. Ubach*, 387-411.

70. *In Ap., ep. ad Euseb.* (PL 93: 129-34).

71. "quaedam regulae mysticae," *Doctr. chr.*, Bk. 3, c. 30, n. 43 (Combès-Farges, 396). Bede had also reproduced them, *Ep.* 12 (94: 695-7).

72. *In Ap., praef.*: "although he brought together many honeyed facets of the spiritual senses, he commingled them with the poison of falsehood" (Cologne, 1536).

73. "vir per omnia catholicus atque in divinis Scripturis eruditus"

74. *In Ap.*, Bk. 3 (470-1); comp. Primasius (PL 68: 823 A). Primasius is Autpertus's main source: S. Bovo, "Le Fonti del commento di Ambrogio Autperto, nel Apocalisse, Misc. biblica . . . ," R. P. Athan. Miller oblata (*St. ans.*, 27-8, 1951), 372-403.

75. *In Ap.*, Bk. 2 (PL 117: 1014 BD, 1016 CD).

76. Alcuin, who knew Autpertus's commentary and declared it to be "quite beautiful" (PL 100: 1088 A), does not follow him on this point.

77. "doctorum solertia attestante"

78. This very general word admitted of many meanings. Cf. Junilius, *De part. div. legis*, Bk. 1, c. 9, *De modis Scripturarum:* there are two of them, "either in Hebrew measures . . . or in simple speech" = verse and prose (PL 68: 20 C).

79. "Notandum est, illis qui in hoc libro parum spiritale contineri contendant, quod hic Scriptura, sicut in multis divinis voluminibus, non solum tribus modis dignoscitur, juxta illud Salomonis: 'Ecce descripsi eam tripliciter,' verum etiam multipliciter contineri, secundum quod in libro beati Job inscribitur: 'Atque utinam, inquit, Deus loqueretur tecum, et ostenderet tibi secreta sapientiae, et quod multiplex ejus esset lex.' Quod, doctorum solertia attestante, septemforme dignoscuntur. Ipsi sunt enim septem sigilli, quibus iste liber secundum Apocalypsim Joannis, signatus esse proclamatur. . . . Sunt enim historialis, etc." *In libros Reg. praef. apol.* (PL 115: 245-6; MGH, *Ep.*, 5, 625).

80. *Loc. cit.* Angelome takes four examples from the Book of Kings. There were only two of them in Primasius. Other examples are changed as well.

81. Nonetheless, let us note a doubtful element: the seventh sense seems to be quite close to the second. The distinction between them, however, is justified: "Although this mode seems similar to the second, there is a distinction to be made according to the following rationale, the fact that the latter is reducible merely to morals, while the former is reducible to faith" (PL 115: 246 C).

82. "Verum, licet isti modi multipliciter istic inveniantur, tamen, juxta jugitatem triplicis divisionis, studuimus primum historicam, quae gesta depromit, tangere; deinde allegoricam significationem, quae fidem aedificat, pandere; ad extremum quoque moralitatem, quae vitam honestam componit, subnectere; ne pondere solius et unius intelligentia pressus, aut historiae et allegoriae mole gravatus, desidosious necae occasionem possit invenire excusationis, sed potius cum hac paupertate discurrere valeat provocatus per campos ovans latissimos doctorum." *Loc. cit.* (246 CD).

Notes to Chapter Two
§3. The First Formula

1. *Esquisse*, 98-9.

2. *Verbum Domini* 9 (1929), 212: "It is certain that this fourfold division (in opposition to the threefold division that was common to the earlier centuries) began to be made use of frequently . . . by writers in the twelfth century"; and *Scritti di erudizione e de filologia* 2 (1958), 320. Followed, among others, by Gr. Calendra.

3. *La vie et les oeuvres de Guiard de Laon* (1956), 165.

4. *L. de var. quaest.*, c. 9, n. 5-6: "Some have said that Holy Scripture is to be understood in four ways . . . . Others have affirmed that Sacred Scripture is to be understood in a threefold way only for purposes of preaching" (Vega — Anspach, 1940, 31).

5. *De vita sua*, Bk. 1, c. 17 (PL 156: 874 B). I must confess that I do not completely understand the explanations that he adds (874-5).

6. Al. of Hales (*Summa*, tr. introd. q. 1, a 4, 1), who intended to prove that "Bede"

counts four senses and Hugh three senses, would give another reason: "Hugh, who posited the matter of Divine Scriptures as a work of restoration, posited only three ways of understanding it. Bede, who understood the matter of Divine Scriptures as being not merely a work of restoration, but rather the cause of it, added anagogy, which refers to the cause of the mode of understanding, just as the other three refer to its effect" (Q., 1, 12).

7. "Quidam . . . addere solent anagogen; secundum quos sacra Scriptura non erit *funiculus triplex*, sed quadruplex. Sed nos, eam sub allegoria credimus contineri."

8. "in simplicem allegoriam et anagogen," *Sent.*, Bk. 1, p. 1, c. 6 (R. Martin, 173, 174); 175: "For this reason, that which is allegory is called anagogy." From this we get the order adopted by Pseudo-Rabanus: history, allegory, anagogy, and tropology (PL 112: 331 C).

9. *Speculum de mysteriis Ecclesiae*

10. "Quadruplicem sensum Scripturarum . . . , id est, historialem, allegoricum, tropologicum et anagogicum."

11. "Scriptura sacra . . . triplicem habet sensum, historialem, allegoricum, moralem." PL 177: 342 B, 374 D. And the *De contemplatione* on the "fourfold inquiry: one part is history, a certain part is allegory, another part is tropology, and another part is anagogy" (Baron, 69; 3 B, *De div. eloquiorum inquisitione*).

12. "Super haec ante omnia illud divinum est, ad quod ducit divina Scriptura sive in allegoria sive in tropologia." PL 176: 184-5 and 185 D.

13. *De contempl.*: "If you like, science pertains to history, wisdom to anagogy or allegory, and understanding to tropology" (Baron, 58); etc.

14. *In Matt.*, Bk. 1, c. 2: "Others say that allegory is made known through the gold, history through the myrrh, and anagogy through the frankincense" (PL 92: 13 C). Cf. Rabanus.

15. "For when the one truth takes its rise, many lies are destroyed. In the first place, we should understand Holy Scripture literally, making whatever is taught by way of precepts into ethics. Secondly, we should understand it through allegory, that is to say, a spiritual understanding. Thirdly, we should understand it by way of future beatitude" (PL 40: 1230). Cf. Jerome. (The omission is not total, for in this case the literal consists of moral precepts.)

16. *De trip. tab.*, P. 3, c. 8, n. 152: "If, therefore, you meditate on the law of the Lord day and night, if you constantly keep in mind Sacred Scripture, which proposes examples of holiness to us through history, the true and believable faith through allegory, and the happiness of heavenly joys through anagogy . . ." (PL 198: 757 D).

17. *Ibid.*, end of the phrase: "you have the truly gilded table, with its four legs, shining on your tabernacle."

18. Manuscript texts cited by B. Smalley, *Spec.* 6 (1931); compare 63 (four senses) and 64 (three senses).

19. *In Nahum*, n. 72 ff.: "Just as the explanation of the preceding matters was fourfold, so what follows is to be considered in a fourfold way" (PL 96: 740 C); on 1, 3: "And the cloud is the dust of his feet." "But these matters are historical" (740 D). "In allegorical terms the prophets were the Savior's feet. . . . Thus those feet brought down the Savior of the world to us, by showing him figuratively through the manifold evidence of their deeds, by foretelling of him with their mystic eloquence" (740 D, 744 C). "Let what has been said about the feet of Christ suffice; now let the following

explanation teach us what reference they have to the Church. . . . In general both are spoken of in the same or similar ways" (749 CD). "The feet of his soul are his affective dispositions" (751 A).

20. "unum, in quo uni Dei Verbo natura nupsit humana; aliud, in quo Christo sponso nupsit Ecclesia."

21. "Deo cotidie anima nubit perfecta." *S. ined.*, 4, *In Epiph.* (H. Talbot, 48).

22. "Quadriga hujus viae sunt quatuor divinorum eloquiorum species: historica, ethica, allegorica, anagogica, quibus ad omnem sacrarum litterarum intellectum, illuminante gratia, inducimur." *De praedest. c. J. Sc.* (PL 115: 1352 B).

23. "littera, tropologia, mystica intelligentia (= allegoria), anagoge," *Ad Elip.*, Bk. 1, c. 104 (PL 96: 958 A).

24. See below, n. 53.

25. "In Scriptura sacra triplex est sensus . . . historicus vid., allegoricus et anagogicus." *Hexaem.*, Bk. 4 (PL 91: 1688).

26. "Triplex namque est divinarum Scripturarum intelligentia: historica, mystica, moralis." *In Lev.*, c. 6 (PL 91: 343 A); *De tab.*, Bk. 3, c. 13: "Scripture, which has habitually been interpreted in an historical, allegorical, and moral sense" (462 B).

27. "nunc foris, nunc in plateis, nunc juxta angulos insidians"

28. "Per triplicem situm locorum non incongrue tripartitus intellectus sacrae Scripturae potest intelligi. . . ."

29. *In Prov.*, c. 8 (PL 91: 1053 BC). On Samuel, in Bk. 3, c. 2, he speaks of a threefold spiritual sense, which makes four senses (619 BC, 621 C).

30. "triplex ratio"

31. "Dederunt [discipuli Domini] geminam Scripturarum interpretationem, ut post primam vid. historiae lectionem, quae ante ejus incarnationem per legem completa est, ipse allegoricum quoque et anagogicum sensum, qui vel praesentis gratiae veritati, vel futurae vitae beatitudini congrueret, actu susceptae dispensationis aperiret. . . .

. . . Litterae superficiem saepe versando ac retractando, quid in hac Christi mysteriis, quid Ecclesiae catholicae statui, quid castigandis singulorum moribus allegorice congruat inspicimus . . . ," *In Sam.*, Bk. 2, c. 2 (PL 91: 562 AC). In the same passage, a little further on, there is an explicit reference to tropology: "Up to this point we have dealt succinctly with anointing, drawing on an allegorical explanation. But we have also approached it tropologically, that is to say, according to the rules of moral understanding etc." (564 A).

32. *In libros Reg. praef., apol.* (MGH, *Ep.*, V, 625).

33. "Quae scripta sunt propter nos, describere tripliciter poteris, ut copiosa refectio sit in tribus panibus, historiae, allegoriae et moralitatis." *In diebus rog. s.*, n. 4 (PL 185: 154 A).

34. "In divina pagina, spiritualis legis perscrutator, tria subjacent inquisitioni tuae, sc. historia, allegoria et moralitas." *In Cant. moralitates* (under the name of Ph. of Harv.: PL 213: 551 D, etc.).

35. "Quae res nobis et tripertitam, ut et in aliis fecimus, explanationis materiam subjicit, ita ut benedictiones historiae locum servent, prophetia vero mysticum atque dogmaticum, morum correptio et objurgatio moralem dirigat stylum." *De bened.*, Bk. 2 (PL 21: 314 BC; cf. 315-27). Honorius, who follows this order himself, attributes the opposite order to Rufinus: "Rufinus . . . discussed Jacob's blessing on the Patriarchs in three ways, that is to say, in its historical, moral, and mystical senses"; in this case he

depends on Gennadius: *De script. eccl.*, Bk. 2, *ex Gennadio sublectus*, c. 17 (PL 172: 213 B; cf. 58: 1070 B).

36. *In Cant.*, Bk. 4: "He takes her into the room, which is Sacred Scripture. First he imbibes it in an historical sense, secondly in a moral sense, thirdly in an allegorical sense, and fourthly in an anagogical sense" (PL 206: 209 C). "In the spirit there are three measures, three understandings of Scripture: historical, mystical, and moral" (495 A).

37. There is no intention of making a search in some rare lists where the order is manifestly overthrown for an extrinsic reason, for example, in Pseudo-Bede, *In Matt.*, c. 2 (PL 92: 13 C; above, n. 14).

38. *Formulae sp. int.* (C. Wotke, 5).

39. *Ad Elip.*, Bk. 1, c. 104 (PL 96: 958 A); cf. c. 100 (956); c. 110 (962).

40. *In Ap.*, v. 2 (PL 17: 801 BD); v. 7 (960-1, 968 B).

41. See above, n. 22.

42. *H. in prol. Jo.* (PL 122: 290 C); *In Jo.*, fr. 3 (340 B); fr. 1 (312). *Div. nat.*, Bk. 3 (705-6). *In Hier. cael.* (146 AC).

43. "Sic, Deus, haec praesta nobis intexere gesta,
Ut modo morali sensu, modo spirituali
Illa subornemus et junctim continuemus."

MGH, *Scr.* 2, 414 (c. 1066)

44. "superaddendo historiali (sensui) moralem et, post, spiritualem," *In ps. 22* (PL 93: 599 C). Cf. 9. Morin, *RB* 28 (1911), 331-40.

45. *In ps. 8* (PL 131: 184 B).

46. *Th. chr.*, Bk. 2: "What dishes could be lacking at the spiritual table of the Lord, which is Sacred Scripture, seeing that in it, according to Gregory, we find both the elephant, which swims, and the lamb, which walks? The understanding of Scripture has such an abundant and plenteous store of delightful foods, that it alone encompasses the perfection of doctrine with a threefold exposition" (PL 178: 1210 AB).

47. *In Hex.*: "Delving, therefore, into the great and unfathomable abyss of Genesis with a threefold exposition, namely, one that is historical, moral, and mystical"; "Because we have pursued our research into the foregoing matters by using history as our basis as much as possible, it pleases us to delve diligently into the same matters by making use of a moral exposition, followed presently by a mystical one" (PL 178: 731 D, 770 B). In his Hymn for Sunday, second nocturn, Abelard adopts the other order: "a historical, mystical, and moral reading (of Scripture)" (1775-6).

48. "juxta historiam, juxta tropologiam, juxta intelligentiam spiritualem . . . spiritualem theoriam," *In Eccl.* (PL 168: 1230 CD).

49. "sive utilium historiarum, sive moralium doctrinarum, sive allegoricarum expositionum," *In Soph.*, Bk. 2 (668 D).

50. "Prima facies ejus est historia, altera moralitas, tertia allegoria, quarta anagoge, id est sensus de superioribus." *De temp.*, *s.* 10 (PL 195: 204 CD).

51. "primae historiales, secundae morales, tertiae allegoricae, quartae anagogicae," *s.* 9 (PL 194: 1721 D).

52. *S.* 10: "And in Jewish literature we are delving into historical and moral understanding, even allegorical understanding, and sometimes anagogical understanding" (1725 D).

53. *In unum ex quatuor, praef.* (PL 186: 16 D). Cf. P. Glorieux, *Mél. de Ghellinck,* 2, 716-7.

54. B. Hauréau, *Not. et extraits des mss. de la Bible nat.* 32 (1888), 122-3. And sermon 112 in Hildebert's collection: "For if we return to moral doctrine, allegorical understanding, historical truth, and anagogical revelation . . ." (PL 171: 862 C).

55. *S.* 16 and 39 (PL 211: 100 AC, 227 AB).

56. PL 188: 1333 C: "the surface of history, the sweetness of morals, and a mystical understanding."

57. *Perfid. Jud.*, c. 25 (PL 207: 855 B).

58. *Scala perfectionis,* Bk. 2, c. 43 (French translation by Noctinger-Bouvet [1923], 2, 318-9).

59. *Opera omnia,* 7 (1898), 145.

60. ". . . Offerebat alius aurum, sensum spiritualem, quod est in Ecclesia mystica intelligentia; alius argentum, eloquium, id est, tropologicam sive moralem intelligentiam, alius aeris vocem, id est, historicam intelligentiam.

Scriptura enim sancta tripliciter intelligenda est: primo ut historice, secundo ut tropologice, tertio ut mystice intelligatur. Historice namque juxta litteram, tropologice juxta moralem scientiam, mystice juxta spiritualem intelligentiam. Ergo sic oportet in Ecclesia catholica fidem tenere, ut Scripturas historialiter debeamus legere, moraliter interpretari, et spiritualiter intelligere." S. Beati *presb. hispani liebanensis. In Apoc. ac plurimas utriusque foederis paginas commentaria* (H. Florez, 1780), 175; Alv. of Cordoba, *Ep.* 5, n. 3, comparing Scripture to a dove: "Consequently, because Sacred Scripture stands out as having been written by the Spirit of God, it bears inward parts of gold besides its exterior features of silver. Whatever it contains of an historical nature, whatever it teaches morally and whatever it actively shapes I would call its wings. Not without justification is the dove's back understood to be anything that it bears which is mystical and spiritual and rendered weightlessly light by the misty realm of allegory" (J. Madoz, 151-2).

Notes to Chapter Two
§4. The Second Formula

1. Thus K. Rand, *Founders of the Middle Ages* (1928), 86-7.

2. "usu receptissimum fuit, ut quatuor sensus Scripturarum in plerisque confingerentur . . . , quorum primum dixerunt litteralem, secundum moralem aut tropologicum, tertium allegoricum, quartum anagogicum." *Clavis Scripturae, seu de sermone sacrarum litterarum, authore Matthia Flacio Illyrico,* ed. ult., alt. pars (Basel, 1618), 64; and 71.

3. *Hexaem.*, Bk. 4 (PL 91: 168 BC); *De tab. et vasis ejus,* Bk. 1, c. 6 (410 B); *In Lev.*, c. 6 (342-3); *In Cant.*, Bk. 4 (1142 AB); *De schematis et tropis,* c. 12: "Sometimes, in one and the same thing or word, the historical dimension and the mystical sense of Christ or the Church are figuratively communicated, together with the facets of tropology and anagogy" (90: 185-6). Cf. *In Sam.*, Bk. 2: "with respect to allegory . . . , with respect to the tropological implications of the law" (91: 601 A); Bk. 3, c. 2 (619 BC). Cf. Claudius, *In Gen.* (91: 221 A).

4. This is the case with Guibert de Nogent (PL 156: 25).

5. *Quodl.*, Bk. 7, q. 6, a. 15, sed contra.

6. "vir undecumque doctissiumus," "vir et ipse in Scripturis sanctis multum eruditus," *H. eccl.*, Bk. 5, c. 18 (PL 95: 261 A).

7. "allegorica ac tropologica disputatio," *Ep.* 5, to Ehfridus: "There is no doubt that they take up the better sayings that arise from allegorical and tropological disputation, divided in two as these sayings are. They thirstily gather them up, as if they were honey, amid the dark and enigmatic problems that come from on high. And then, seeing fit to retain the sayings by a process of continuous meditation right until death, they conceal them in the beehives of wisdom etc." (MGH, *A. ant.*, 15, 491).

8. "quadriformis ecclesiastica traditio," "secundum historiam, allegoriam, tropologiam, anagogen"

9. "Catholici patres," *De laud. virginitatis*, c. 4: "at this point the fourfold sayings of the gospel account should be investigated with care and skill. These sayings have been explicated by the mystical commentaries of the Catholic Fathers. They have been explained spiritually in a way that strikes to the marrow, and they have been cataloged by some writers according to the history, allegory, tropology, and anagogy that are features of the fourfold ecclesiastical tradition" (232).

10. "historiae simplici expositione et spiritalis tripertita intelligentiae interpretatione imbutus," Willibaldus, *V.S. Bonif.*, c. 2, n. 7 (MGH, *Scr.*, 2, 336).

11. *St. patr.*, 1, 502-3, note.

12. Laistner is more correct when he writes, 159: "At times he recognizes a threefold or even a fourfold sense."

13. A. Wilmart, *RB* 32 (1920), 51. G. Morin, *Etudes, textes, découvertes* (1913), 3-4. Texts that have been compiled by Augustine, Gregory, and others can be found in the *Clavis*.

14. "allegoricus, qui dicitur acutior; moralis, qui est dulcior," *Clavis, De homine*, 7 (Pitra, 2, 203).

15. The symbol occurs in Ambrose, who adopts it in inverse order, *In ps. 118*, s. 18, n. 20: "the Church has two eyes, one that sees mystical things and the other that sees moral things; this is because Holy Church does not only hold fast to the discipline of morals, but also teaches the secrets of the heavenly mysteries" (PL 15: 1431 C); Paschasius, *In Lam. Jer.*, Bk. 3: ". . . the eyes of the Church, because the bride has two eyes, the moral one and the mystical one; but the mystical eye sees God more fully and clearly, although the moral eye seems more sweet" (120: 1181 D). For others, the two eyes are the two Testaments: Beatus, *In Ap.* (120).

16. *Hom.* 2: "in this historical account, some things seem to be rather obscure. There are certain mystical facets to it, and also some aspects that are fruitful in establishing a moral understanding" (PL 87: 597 C).

17. *In Hebr. IX:* "according to the mystical sense . . . according to the tropological sense" (PL 103: 264 A).

18. "historia, allegoria, tropologia, anagoge," *In Gal. 4*, with regard to the name of Jerusalem (191 A). Cf. *Explan., in Praef. Hieronymi* (350 A).

19. *Int. nominum hebraicorum progenitorum D.N.J.C.*: literal, allegorical, and moral interpretation (PL 100: 725-34).

20. *De eccl. off.*, Bk. 4, c. 3: "In it there is no lack of history, no lack of allegory, no lack of tropology, and no lack of anagogy" (PL 105: 1182-3).

21. *Exp. in Matt.* (PL 106: 1275 D; see above, Chapter 1.3, n. 3). Nevertheless, *ibid.*,

1267 B, on Noah: "according to natural philosophy . . . according to ethics . . . according to logic, that is to say, reason . . . ."

22. *In Gen.*, Bk. 3 (PL 50: 1029 D); *In Reg.*, Bk. 3 (1103 CD); *30 Quaest. sup. libros Reg.* (104: 771 A).

23. Querying letter on the subject of the thirty questions: "they should be sent on to me after you have shed some light on them, not only in terms of history, but also in terms of allegory or tropology. In the first place, consider how things stand in relation to history. Secondly, see if there is anything gained by allegory. Thirdly, look at everything in terms of morality" (PL 104: 624 A).

24. *Prothemata* (PL 113: 63 B).

25. *In Cant.*, c. 4: "according to the letter . . . according to allegory . . . according to morality . . . according to anagogy" (PL 117: 321 C).

26. *In Gen.*, c. 28, 2; c. 32, 24 (PL 131: 105-6, 110 B).

27. *In Lam.*, Bk. 1 (PL 120: 1086, 1088-90, 1092-3); Bk. 2 (1109-10, 1118-9, 1122-5), etc.

28. "historialem, allegoricam, et moralem significationem," *In Gen.* (PL 115: 212 B; 110 CD); *In Reg.* (MGH, *Ep.* 5, 625).

29. "ut historia veritatem factorum ac fidem relationis inculcet, et spiritalis intelligentia ad caelestium figurarum secreta perducat, et moralis persuasio ad meliorationem vitae invitet." To Leotricus (MGH, *Ep.* 5, 622). It can be seen here how spiritual understanding is anagogy, understood as a fullness of allegory.

30. "plane factum . . . spiritalis intelligentiae sacramentum . . . virtutis exemplum," *S.* 48 (PL 144: 768 D). "This signifies the Jewish people and the gentiles. . . . But these things can also be understood morally" (544 CD).

31. "Dissolutis nebulis allegoriae, hunc etiam rivulum Scripturae ad irrigandos mores nostros possumus trahere." *S.* 71 (PL 144: 907 C): a text with a Gregorian flavor to it.

32. *Opusc.* 7 (first half of the eleventh century): "Once the things that seemed to pertain to the mystical interpretation of Sunamitis were resolved, we reckoned it as a part of the price of this undertaking when, to this work, we added a few things that are suited to morality" (PL 142: 817 AB).

33. *In amorem claustri et desid. lect. div.* (G. Morin, *RB*, 31, 248).

34. *S. in d. Palm.* (G.-S., 2, 120); cf. *In Epiph.* (60).

35. "quid distet . . . inter allegoriam, tropologiam et anagogen. . . . Primum a docente sensus ponendus est litterae, deinde ipsa littera per allegoriam elucidanda, inde per moralitatem vita legentis instituenda." *Dial. sup. auctores* (Schepss, 20, 46).

36. *Proem. ad tropol.* (PL 156: 339-40); *De vita sua*, Bk. 1: "according to the rules of the ancient authors . . ." (874 B); *Trop. in Os.* (384 B).

37. "aut allegoricae sunt, aut morales, aut anagogicae," *In Lev.*, Bk. 15, preface: "Therefore the forms of things are either allegorical or moral or anagogical" (185 H).

38. *In Cant.* (PL 172: 359 BD; cf. 349 AB, etc.); *Sacramentarium*, c. 12 (748-9); *De dedic.* (1102 B); *De an. exsilio*, c. 12 (1245 CD). Honorius always counts four senses.

39. C. 194, like a storeroom: "simple history — allegory — morality — anagogy, that is to say, contemplation" (PL 159: 707 D, 708 D).

40. "And both moralities answer quite well to the same mystery, etc." (Leclercq, *St. ans.*, 31, 125, note).

41. "Scripturarum intelligentia . . . secundum historialem et mysticum et moralem sensum." *In I Cor.*, c. 1 (PL 181: 817 B); cf. *In Is.*, Bk. 1 (66-7).

42. *De sacram.*, Bk. 1, prol., c. 4-7 (PL 176: 184-5). *Did.*, Bk. 5, c. 1; Bk. 6, c. 2-4 (176: 789 D and 799-805); *De scriptis et scriptor. sacris*, c. 3-4, 13, 16 (175: 11-12, 12-13, 20 C, 24 A).

43. *De tribus max. circum. st. gestorum* (W. M. Green, *Speculum* 18 [1943], 491).

44. *In Threnos:* "With regard to the letter . . . according to the allegorical sense . . . according to the moral understanding . . ." (PL 175: 255-9); *ibid.* (286-322).

45. ". . . Si ergo Seraphim Scripturam sacram significat, tria paria alarum sunt intellectus ejusdem Scripturae, id est, historia, allegoria, tropologia; quae singula idcirco bina sunt, quia singula ad dilectionem Dei et proximi legentium animos accendunt.

Duae alae quae corpus Seraphim tegunt, historia est, quae per velamen litterae mysticos tegit intellectus. — Duae alae quae usque ad caput et pedes Domini extenduntur, allegoria est; quia cum mystica divinae Scripturae dicimus, usque ad ipsius divinitatis agnitionem, quae ante omnia et post omnia est, per illuminationem mentis penetramus. . . . — Duae alae quibus volabant Seraphim, tropologiam significant, quia dum per lectionem divinae Scripturae ad bona opera instruimur, quasi quibusdam alis ad alta sublevamur. . . ." *De arca mor.*, Bk. 1, c. 2 (PL 176: 624-5); cf. Bk. 4, c. 9 (678 CD).

46. ". . . Meditatio in lectione est triplicis considerationis: secundum historiam, allegoriam, tropologiam. — Secundum historiam est, quando eorum quae facta sunt rationem vel quaerimus, vel admiramur, suis temporibus et locis, et modo congruo perfectam . . . — Secundum allegoriam meditatio operatur in dispositione praecedentium, futurorum significationem attendens mira ratione et providentia coaptam sicut oportuit ad intelligentiam, et fidei formam fabricandam. — In tropologia meditatio operatur quem fructum dicta afferant, exquirens quid faciendum insinuent. . . ." *De meditando . . . opusc. aureum* (PL 176: 994 BC).

47. Bk. 1, tit. 13 (PL 177: 485 A); tit. 96 (525-6); Bk. 3, tit. 54 (670 BC); tit. 62 (674 A); Bk. 4, tit. 2 (703 AB). Cf. *De trib. m. circ.:* "All explication of Divine Scriptures is handled according to a threefold sense, namely, history, allegory, and tropology, that is to say, morality" *(loc. cit.)*.

48. C. 3 (PL 177: 342 B); c. 8 (374-5).

49. *Ep. anonymi ad Hugonem amicum suum de modo et ord. legendi sacram Script.:* "It must be understood that the reading of both Testaments is tripartite. The first of these readings is according to history, the second is according to allegory, and the third is according to moral instruction or, to phrase it more aptly, tropology" (PL 213: 715 A).

50. *Microc.*, c. 87, 88, 201 (Delhaye, 99-100, 221-2). *Fons philosophiae* (see above, Introduction).

51. *De claustro animae,* Bk. 3, c. 8: "threefold understandings of Divine Scripture, namely, the historical, mystical, and moral" (PL 176: 1097 D); c. 17-23 (1118-25); Bk. 4 (1131-82).

52. "quadriformis sacrae Scripturae sensus," *In Jud.*, Bk. 2 (Pez, 4, 3989); Bk. 1: "the letter of the Old Testament . . . which is redolent of allegory, morality, and anagogy" (158).

53. "triplex sensus, historicus, allegoricus, et moralis," *In Ruth* (Pez, 4, 464); *In Jud.* (30, 151-2, 160, 162, 275 . . .).

54. *S.* 8, c. 11; *s.* 9, c. 1: "And let these allegorical sayings be enough for you. We shall show you in another sermon what could have occurred in terms of a moral understanding. Because, in the preceding sermon, the allegorical sense detained us for

some time, we held off just now when it came to saying what had to be said in the name of morality" (PL 19: 146 A and C).

55. *Trip. tab.* (PL 198: 630, 697, 743 B); *Ep. Adami* (792 D).

56. "Cum animam pertransit gladius verbi, quis non solum enarrare sed comprehendere sufficit, quot vel quales revelentur cogitationes? Multae profecto, et multis modis revelantur cogitationes, pertranseunte verbi gladio animam, juxta quod idem gladius suam vel multiplicat vel variat percussionem. Nam frequenter et diverso modo animam feriendo pertransit:

Primo etenim, exempla sanctorum in ejus percussione narrantur, et pertransit animam historia. — Secundo, veritas fidei revelatur, et tangit eam allegoria. — Tertio, mores instruuntur, et percutit eam tropologia. — Quarto, superna gaudia revelantur, et suaviter vulnerat eam anagogia.

Videte si non in iactu historiae revelantur cogitationes excitatae ad imitationem sanctitatis, in allegoria illustratae ad agnitionem veritatis, in tropologia succensae ad amorem virtutis, in anagogia liquefactae ad desiderium supernae felicitatis." *S.* 38, n. 4 (PL 198: 344 AB).

57. PL 112: 849-50. Long attributed to Rabanus, these *Allegoriae* surely date back only to the second half of the twelfth century. On the authorship of Adam Scotus: A. Vaccari, *Biblica* 18 (1937), 456-7; Petit, *Prémontrés*, 171. Nevertheless, the theory of the four senses is not, as many have believed it to be, a sufficient indication of this late date.

58. *S.* 1, n. 1: "That festive day of the Jews, on which their fathers crossed over from Egypt, was a mere shadow. But that day, on which Christ crossed over from this world, was sheer truth. And thus he makes us cross over from vice to virtue, from death to life, from the world to heaven" (PL 184: 880 D).

59. *S. in verba Cant.* 8, 13: "There is a need for investigation, not only that mystical things may be unearthed, but also that things of moral import may be extracted" (PL 185: 211 BC). *In diebus rogat. s.*, n. 4 (185: 154 A).

60. *In assumpt., s.* 2: "Once history has been examined, let us turn our attention to a spiritual understanding. Once allegory has been looked at, let us turn our attention to morality" (Tissier, 6, 116; Wilmart, *R. Mab.*, 11, 1922, 33: s. 18). *S.* 25: "There are three senses in Sacred Scripture: the historical, moral, and allegorical senses" (W., 37).

61. *Ep.* 3: "While the mystical and moral senses were wrapped up in a literal covering" (PL 203: 29 C).

62. *L. de sacr. alt.*: "Historically . . . Spiritual understanding . . . Moral understanding" (PL 204: 707-8).

63. *In Cant.*, c. 5 (PL 202: 1274 B); c. 8 (1298 C).

64. "Allegorically . . . morally . . . anagogically" (H. Farmer, *St. ans.*, 41, 183-7).

65. PL 171: 634 BC: "history, allegory, morality, anagogy"; or *Hist. scol.*: history, allegory, tropology, anagogy (198: 1054-5). Father Vaccari, *Scritti*, 2, 230, thinks that Peter "non insegna che tre sensi" [= "espouses only three senses"?]. The question would be trifling if it were only a question of number. But the author sees Peter as a witness to a ternary formula destined to be ousted by another formula, a quaternary one, whose structure and spirit would end up being different.

66. "Vetus et novum Testamentum fideliter amplectitur, qui . . . historiam, allegoriam, tropologiam et anagogen fideliter complectitur." Sect. 2 (PL 199: 949 B). The work would not be John of Salisbury's: *BTAM*, 8, 229.

67. "Divinae paginae libros, quorum singuli apices divinis pleni sunt sacramentis, tanta gravitate legendos forte concesserim, eo quod thesaurus Spiritus sancti cujus digito scripti sunt omnino nequeat exhauriri. Licet enim ad unum tantummodo sensum accommodata sit superficies litterae, multiplicitas mysteriorum intrinsecus latet. Et ab eadem re saepe allegoria fidem, tropologia mores variis modis aedificat. Anagoge quoque multipliciter sursum ducit, ut litteram non modo verbis, sed rebus ipsis instituat." Bk. 7, c. 12 (199: 666 AB).

68. "Doctrina Christi parvulos lactat historia, majores exercet allegoria, subtiles sensu morali, contemplativos animos anagoge." Preface (J. Chatillon, *RTAM*, 23, 52, n. 36; cf. 55).

69. *Alleg. sup. Tab. M.* (Moore-Corbett, 1).

70. "Mentem elevat species, significatio suspendit, sapientia excipit: littera in specie, allegoria in significatione, sensus moralis in virtute sapientiae." *S.* 70 (PL 202: 860 D); *S.* 31: "Sometimes historically . . . sometimes allegorically . . . , sometimes morally" (732 B); *S.* 86: "Thus the sacred books should be approached with zeal, and this zeal should be fixed immovably on the three legs of history, allegory, and morals" (899 D). However, *s.* 69 speaks of: "letter, allegory, morality, and anagogy" (858 A).

71. *L. de panibus*, c. 7 (PL 202: 960 CD); *Mos. tab. mystica et mor. exp.*, Bk. 1 (1048 C, 1050 A).

72. *S.* 21 (PL 205: 706 B); *s.* 34 (790 A).

73. *S.* 7 (205: 686 A).

74. PL 171: 818 D (3 senses); 877-80 (4 senses).

75. *Defl.*, Bk. 2 (PL 157: 1235 CD). Cf. P. Glorieux, *Mél. de Ghellinck*, 699-721.

76. *S. 18, in ramis palm.* (PL 208: 815-9, 822-4, etc.). *In ded. eccl., s.* 2 (209: 16 A). *De div., s.* 2 (167 D).

77. Stegmüller edition, *Div. Thomas* (Plac.) 1942, 310; 1943, 375. Cited by J. de Ghellinck, *Mél. Pelzer*, 42.

78. "Totam bibliothecam historice, allegorice, tropologice et anagogice Paulae et Eustachio exposuit." *Verb. abbr.*, c. 2 (PL 205: 26 B).

79. "Quantum in praefatis libris historiae gravitas declaratur, allegorica profunditas discutitur, necnon et morum quorumlibet qualitas depingitur." Prologue, edition of R. Wasselynck, *L'influence des Moralia* . . . (photocopied thesis, Lille, 1950), 399.

80. *In ps. 3* (PL 191: 80-1).

81. PL 203: 550 D; the historical, allegorical, and moral Jacob (496-7, 498 CD, 500 B); cf. 551 D, 554 BD, 568 A, etc.

82. *Sent.*, n. 21 (PL 210: 240 BC). His "Summa quot modis seu Distinctiones" [= "Summa of the Many Ways or Distinctions"] is an explication of biblical terms following the three senses.

83. P. 2, vis. 5, c. 47-9 (PL 197: 953-6).

84. On the first letter of Dionysius to Gaius: "carefully instructed in the mystical and moral expositions of the Scriptures" (A. Dondaine, *RTAM*, 17, 313).

85. *S.* 4 (PL 217: 330 A); *s.* 18 (396 AB); *In f. D. Greg.* (515-6); *In f. S.J. Bapt.* (541-2); *In comm. de ev., s.* 3 (605-10).

86. *De sacr. alt.*, Bk. 1, c. 11-13 (PL 217: 781-3); Bk. 2, c. 7 (804 AB); *L. de quadrip. specie nup., init.* (923 AC); *In 7 ps. paenit.*, 5 (1096 CD).

87. "Sacrae etiam lectionis quadriformis est intelligentia. Prima est historia, quae est rerum gestarum narratio. Secunda est allegoria, quae est earumdem rerum gestarum

spiritalis significatio. Tertia est tropologia, quae pertinet ad rationem morum. Quarta est anagoge, quae sursum animum ducit." Letter 30 (Bouvet, 213).

88. "species," from a gloss on the *Hist. scol.*: "Sacred Scripture is divided into four kinds, namely, history, allegory, anagogy, and tropology" (Lacombe, *AHDLMA*, 5, 43).

89. "expositiones": "In Sacred Scripture four expository methods are attended to, namely, the historical, the allegorical, the anagogical, and the tropological" (Smalley, *AHDLMA*, 5, 168-9); idem, *Speculum*, 6, 63 (4 senses) and 64 (3 senses) (Smalley).

90. Lacombe, 126.

91. *Postillae in universa biblia sec. quadruplicem sensum: historicum, allegoricum, moralem et anagogicum* (Paris, 1538). Cf. Spicq, *Esquisse*, 292. In fact, "the anagogical sense only occurs when the occasion presents itself" (E. Mangenot, *DTC*, 7, 236).

92. Q. 15, *de oculis animae*: "There are four ways of understanding Sacred Scripture: historical . . . allegorical . . . anagogical . . . moral" (Boeren, 165).

93. *De leg.*, c. 17: allegory, tropology, anagogy (*Opera omnia* [1674], 1, 48, 2).

94. *Comp. errorum papae, init.* (Goldast, 2, 957).

95. Ed. Lov., 170.

96. "Qui nos de petra mellis dulcedine pavit,
significativum promens de simplici sensum
historia, utroque modum moraliter addens."

97. For more on liturgical symbolism, see Aelred's *De temp.*, s. 3 and 22 (PL 195: 227 D, 336 CD).

98. E. de Bruyne, 2, 343-4; 1, 259. Cf. Maurilius of Rouen, *Exo, div. off.*: the Church is constructed "like the human body."

99. "Rex Salomon fecit templum
Quorum instar et exemplum
Christus et Ecclesia . . . ."

Adam of Saint Victor, *Hymne de la Dédicace* (Gautier, 3d ed., 75).

100. *De eccl. off.* (ca. 1160-4), Bk. 3, c. 21 and 35 (PL 177: 452 AC, 455 B); Sicard of Cremona, *Mitrale*, Bk. 6, c. 14 (213: 328-9).

101. *Rat. div. off.*, c. 113 (PL 202: 119 BD).

102. *Mitrale*, Bk. 4, c. 10 (213: 187 AB).

103. *Ibid.*, Bk. 1, c. 13 (47 AC): "The explanation of Sacred Scripture is fourfold etc."

104. Bk. 1, c. 6-10 (28-37). J. Chatillon, "Une ecclésiologie médiévale," *Irenikon*, 22 (1949), 124, n. 3: "The allegorical and tropological interpretation of the liturgy of Dedication holds an important place in the history of Christian spirituality." Lee Bown, "The Tropology of Med. Dedication Rites," *Speculum* 16 (1941), 469-79.

105. *Mitrale*, Bk. 2, c. 7-8 (213: 83-5).

106. Bk. 3, c. 9: "For us the Mass . . . represents a triple struggle: one struggle that prefigures, while the second is what is prefigured; one struggle that is in the head and the other that is in the members etc." (144 CD)

107. L. Bouyer, "Liturgie et exégèse," sp., *La Maison Dieu*, 7, 27-50; *La vie de la liturgie* (1957). The parallel between the spiritual sense of ritual and Scripture is made by Augustine, *De cat. rud.*, c. 26, n. 50 (Combès-Farges, 136-8). Cf. William Durandus, *Rationale div. off., proem.*, n. 18.

108. *Cl. inst.*, Bk. 2, c. 53: "In the Church of Christ the readings from Holy Scripture

are proclaimed. This selfsame Sacred Scripture consists of both the old law and the new, etc." (PL 107: 364 D).

109. "Dicitur Pascha historice, allegorice, tropologice, anagogice." *Mitrale*, Bk. 6, c. 15: "Historically, because when it is related that Passover was celebrated, the destroying angel traversed Egypt . . . ; allegorically, through baptism, the Church makes the journey from infidelity to faith; tropologically, the soul must make its crossing from vice to virtue through confession and contrition; anagogically, Christ made the journey from mortality to immortality . . . so as to enable us to make the journey from the misery of this world to the eternal joys of heaven" (213: 543 CD). There is one time, however, when Sicard gives another order, in Bk. 5, c. 9: The three gifts of the wise men are "either natural philosophy, ethics, and logic, or else history, tropology, and allegory" (235 C).

110. "trifaria intelligentia," PL 146: 262 A.

111. *Distinctiones* (PL 210: 866 CD); *De planctu nat.* (444-5). Cf. Rudolf Allers, *Microcosmus from Anaximandros to Paracelsus* (*Traditio* 2 [1944], 319-407). Cf. Honorius, *Sacram.*, c. 50 (PL 172: 773-4).

112. Delhaye, *E.T.* 151, 171. Brief allusion in Aldhelm, *De laud. virg.*, c. 3 (PL 89: 105 C). The very word, "microcosm," comes from Isidore of Seville. Cf. J. Fontaine, *R. des ét. lat.*, 31 (1953), 283.

113. "Gnothi seauton"

114. ". . . 'Nosce teipsum'. Tripos Apollinis: triplex sapientiae intellectus, historicus, mysticus et moralis. Per historiam homo exterior interiori condescendit; per mysticum homo interior secreta cordis, id est, mentem et conscientiam scrutatur et discutit; per moralem, unde sit, quid et ad quid agnoscit. . . . Sic igitur sapientia in tripode hominis conditionem . . . exprimit." *De sept. septenis*, sect. 6 (PL 199: 956 BC). The same text in *De contemplatione*, 2, *De soliloquio* (Baron, 43); other passages from the *De contempl.* are met with again in the *De sept. sept.* (J. Chatillon, *RMAL* 8 [1952], 272, according to Baron). Helinand talks of the tripod of Apollo, in *De cogn. sui*, c. 2 (PL 212: 723 A). Cf. Bernard (*In Cant.*, s. 23, n. 9), and John of Salisbury on the oracle: *ep.* 297 (199: 345 D). It may be that John Scotus is speaking of Hugh in 960 A: "in following our master."

115. *Microc.*, c. 201 (Delhaye, 221-2). Cf. Delhaye, *E.T.*, c. 7 (137-49).

Notes to Chapter Two
§5. Inversions

1. *Sent.*, Bk. 1, c. 18, n. 12 (PL 83: 579 A). The text alone is cited by S. M. Zarb, OP, "Isidori cultus erga sacras litt." (*Misc. Isidoriana* [1936], 123-4); and by Sr. P. J. Mullins, OP, *The Spiritual Life according to St. Isidore of Seville* (1940), 49; for *Differ.* 2, 5, which is indicated by way of reference; see below, Chapter 3.

2. "Lex divina triplici sentienda est modo. Primo ut historice, secundo ut tropologice, tertio ut mystice intelligatur. Historice namque juxta litteram, tropologice, juxta moralem scientiam, mystice juxta spiritualem intelligentiam, etc.

Quod legis scriptura non solum historialiter, sed etiam mystico sensu, id est, spiritualiter sentienda est, etc. Sic quoque Sapientia per Salomonem dicit: 'Scribe legem dupliciter, et tripliciter in corde tuo.' Dupliciter enim sentitur lex, ut prius secundum historiam, deinde secundum sacramentorum intelligentiam sentiatur. Tripliciter autem

scribitur, dum non solum historialiter, vel mystice, sed etiam moraliter, quid in unumquodque gerere debeat edocetur. . . . Et historia locum habeat, et mysticum sensum recipiat, et in formationem morum contineat." *De fide,* Bk. 1, c. 20, n. 1-3 (PL 83: 528-9).

3. Cf. A. Wilmart, *Le recueil des Pensées de B. Guigue* (1936), 19.

4. "Summa autem utriusque Testamenti trifarie distinguitur, id est, in historia, in moribus, in allegoria." *De universo,* Bk. 5, c. 11 (PL 111: 106 C); *In Num.,* Bk. 2: "let us pass from morals to a mystical understanding" (108: 663 AB).

5. "Triplicem namque in Scripturis divinis intelligentiae inveniri saepe diximus modum, historicum sc., moralem, mysticum; unde et corpus inesse ei et animam et spiritum intelleximus, cujus intelligentiae triplicem formam, sacrificiorum triplex hic apparatus ostendit." *In Lev.,* Bk. 2, c. 4 (PL 108: 310 C).

6. "Judas noster . . . tribus ordinibus pugnat, hoc est, sive sanctae Trinitatis fide, sive triplici dogmate, id est, historico, allegorico atque tropologico." *In 1 Mach.,* c. 5 (PL 109: 1167 D, 1170 B). Cf. *In Ex.,* Bk. 1, c. 21 (108: 43 C); Bk. 3, c. 3 (192-30).

7. "Scriptum est: Funiculus triplex difficile rumpitur; quia nimirum Scriptura, quae historico, allegorico, morali consuevit sensu interpretari, nulla haereticorum sive paganorum valet perversitate corrumpi." *In Ex.,* Bk. 3, c. 17 (PL 108: 188 A).

8. "Doctores sancti auditoribus suis liberam in Scripturis sanctis tribuunt intelligentiam, ut unusquisque quod in lectione divina, sive per allegoriam, sive per tropologiam, sive per anagogiam, juxta votum desiderii sui aperiri quaerit, superna gratia annuente, intrandi accipiat facultatem." *In 1 Mach.,* c. 5 (PL 109: 1170 C). Similarly, *In Deut.,* Bk. 4, c. 1, which appears, at first glance, to name only three members, but where the rest of the sentence gives the equivalent of anagogy: "It befits a sensible reader to preserve the truth of Scripture in history, to ponder the reason for the heavenly mysteries in allegory, and to learn the usefulness of good disciplines in tropology, since, informed as he is by this tripartite distinction, he advances to that realm of heavenly theory, that is, to an examination of secret things and the refined state of divine contemplation" (108: 967-8).

9. "Verba caelestis oraculi, vel historico intellectu, vel allegorico, vel tropologico, id est morali, vel certe anagogico solent accipi." *In Ex.,* Bk. 3, c. 11 (PL 108: 147 D).

10. *In 1 Reg.,* c. 16: In David "the figurative cross of Christ was shown . . . furthermore, tropologically . . ." (PL 109: 50 D). *In 3 Reg.,* c. 9: "they find a valuable sense of history, allegory, tropology, and anagogy in the two Testaments" (192 C).

11. ". . . Sed quia haec moraliter diximus, restat adhuc ut easdem mensas super intelligentiam typicam perscrutemur." *In Ez.,* Bk. 16 (PL 110: 952 B); Bk. 20: "They proclaim everything that they preach by recourse to a mystical and moral sense" (1074 C).

12. "Verba etenim Scripturae sacrae lapides quadri sunt, quia ubique stant, quae ex nullo latere reprehensibilia inveniuntur. Nam in omne quod praeteritum narrant, in omne quod venturum annuntiant, in omne quod moraliter praedicant, in omne quod spiritaliter sonant, quasi in diverso latere statum habent, quia reprehensionem non habent." *In Ez.,* Bk. 16 (953 BC). For Gregory, see below, Chapter 3.3.

13. ". . . In duas dividitur partes, id est, in historicam interpretationem et intelligentiam spiritalem. . . . Spiritalis autem scientiae genera sunt tria, tropologia, allegoria, anagoge." *In Gal. 4* (PL 112: 331 A); *In 1 Cor. 14:* "a fourfold understanding of Sacred Scripture, that is to say, history, tropology, allegory, and anagogy" (112: 130 A).

14. ". . . Historia. . . . Ad allegoriam autem. . . . Anagoge vero. . . . Tropologia. . . .

Igitur praedictae quatuor figurae in unum ita si volumus confluunt, ut una eademque Hierusalem quadrifariam possit intelligi, secundum historiam civitas Judaeorum, secundum allegoriam Ecclesia Christi, secundum anagogen civitas Dei illa caelestis quae mater omnium nostrum, secundum tropologiam anima hominis. . . ." *In Gal.*, c. 4 (331 AC); *In Paral.*, Bk. 3, c. 8 (472 B).

15. *Praef. in Abbrev. Amalarii* (PL 179: 1772-3). A reproach that is so much the less well-founded to the extent that Rabanus was sedulous in indicating his sources.

16. Ch. V. Langlois, *La vie en France au moyen âge*, 3 (1927), 18.

17. *Cler. inst. praef.* (PL 107: 296 B), etc. On the pediment of the library at Fulda he had placed the following inscription (carm. 13; *Poetae lat.*, 2, 187):

> "Whatever God has directed to earth for men from the heights
> Of heaven through the venerable words of Holy Scripture,
> You will find there, whatever the wisdom of the world
> Has brought forth for the common good at various times."

18. B. Blumenkranz, "Raban Maur et S. Aug., compilation ou adaptation?" *RMAL* 7 (1951), 97-110. Rabanus "forms part of that company that leads Latin letters and the language of the classics to a new efflorescence" (109).

19. H. Peltier, *DTC*, 13, 1610, insists deservedly on this aspect of his personality.

20. At that time Mellin of S. Gal.is wrote a poem in the shape of wings: Curtius, 344-5.

21. "Distinguishing words with a colored boundary," he says. Carl Nordenfalk, *Les grands siècles de la peinture, le haut moyen âge*, p. 92.

22. Nordenfalk, 147. E. de Bruyne, 1, 114, 181. *Poet. lat.*, 3, 563, 565: Milo's poems to the glory of King Charles; other examples, *ibid.*, 16-7, 152-9, 224-7, etc. The "painted little works of Porphyry" are among the books collected carefully by St. Eulogius: Alvarus, *V. S. Eul.*, c. 3 (PL 115: 712 C).

23. *Ep.* 2a (MGH, *Ep.* 5, 383).

24. Rémy de Gourmont, *Le latin mystique*, 269.

25. *L'Essor*, 2, 86.

26. *Hist. eccl.*, Bk. 6 (PL 163: 854 B).

27. In his beautiful chapter on the Carolingian poets he devotes only two lines to Rabanus for his poem "De fide cath." (331).

28. *Litt. lat.*, 1, 104.

29. *The Med. Mind*, 1, 223, n. 2: "Raban's excruciating *De laudibus* shows what he would do as a virtuoso in allegorical mystification."

30. "ordo quadratus," "carmen figuratum"

31. Vol. 18, 740 (Vives).

32. Crevier, *H. de l'univ. de Paris*, 1 (1761), 51-2. Nevertheless, Crevier adds, "the hymn 'Veni Creator' proves that this author, for all his lack of elegance and correctness, knew how to imbue his verses with the mellowness of pious sentiments — which has much more merit."

33. Vol. 2, 161.

34. *S.* 15, *de cruce* (PL 142: 1034 B).

35. *De script. eccl.*, c. 89 (PL 160: 567 C). Honorius, *De scr. eccl.*, Bk. 4, c. 4 (172: 230 A); Ademar., *Historiae* (MGH, *Scr.*, 4, 119).

36. "sui temporis poetarum nulli secundus," *Spec. historiale*, Bk. 24, c. 28: "Rabanus

the wise man, second to none in his time, who discussed and researched much in the Holy Scriptures, and who also composed a book in praise of the holy cross, marked by a variety of difficult forms and marvellous poetry etc."; cf. 29 (vol. 4, 1624, 972).

37. *Ep.* 2a (MGH, *Ep.* 5, 383).

38. Cf. P. Boyancé, "Le sens cosmique de Virgile," *REL* 32 (1955), 228.

39. "So that it might be shown that his holy cross binds all things together by its power" (PL 107: 158 D); "He upholds the whole world" (283 C); "For you exceed all things both in heaven and on earth" (290 A); "You adorn the whole world with the beauty of the holy cross" (271 A); etc. Cf. P. Teilhard de Chardin: "The universe takes the form of Jesus, but O what a mystery! It is Jesus crucified who is discovered" (1917).

40. "quae claritate sua cuncta clarificat," *Ep.* 2a (382).

41. PL 107: 147-8.

42. *De laud.*, Bk. 1, fig. 7, tit.: "Regarding the four elements, time's four seasonal changes, the four regions of the world, and the four quarters of the day from sunrise to sunset, the way in which all things are ordered and sanctified in the cross" (107: 175-6).

43. *De laud.*, Bk. 1, fig. 7, exposition of the figure: "Quite rightly, therefore, almost no one is unaware of the number four, which has been hallowed by perfection, and thus the whole world does well to venerate it, transfigured as it has been by the form of Christ's cross" (177 A); "In fact, all these elements are intermingled with each other by a certain natural kinship, as it were, so that they perfect the world's wholeness. Thus, they are also united to each other by the four sections of the cross, so as to demonstrate its perfect beauty and splendor" (177 B), etc.

44. The same process is to be found in the work of Prosper, Aldhelm, Bede, Alcuin, Sedulius Scotus, Bruun *(Vita Eigilis)*, Gauthier of Spira. . . . Sedulius had given the example, doubling up his *Carmen paschale* with an *Opus paschale;* Rabanus derives his warrant from this illustrious precedent: *Ep.* 2a (384).

45. "ordo quadratus"

46. "Respice distinctis quadratum partibus orbem
Ut signum fidei cuncta tuere probet."

This distich was cited by Dungal, *Adv. Claud.* (PL 105: 489 C); "the unique and four-square sign that is on the brow of the faithful." Evangelary of St. Emmeran, motto appended to a miniature (see frontispiece in the French edition of the first volume of *Exégèse médiévale*):

> "The saints in their ranks, which are depicted variously in a foursquare order, behold great glories."

Cf. Ennodius, *Euchar. de vita sua* (Hartel, 394).

47. "opuscula," "commentarioli," "explanatiunculae," *Ep.* 28, to Lotharius (MGH, *Ep.* 5, 443).

48. "carmina quadrata," "orbis quadratus," "lapides quadrati," "homo quadratus." On this poem: A. Bonnet, *Notice sur 2 mss. carolingiens à miniatures exécutés à Fulda* (Bibl. de l'Ec. des chartes, 65, 1904); E. de Bruyne, 1, 181. Reproduction of two dedicatory scenes: J. Prochno, *Das Schneiber- u. das Dedikationsbild in der deutschen Buchmalerei* (1929), 2. On Rabanus: J. B. Hablitzel, *Hrabanus Maurus, ein Beitrag zur Gesch. der Mittelalterlichen*

Exegese (Bibl. Stud. 2 [1906]); Paul Lehmann, "Zu Hraban's geistiger Bedentung" (*St. Bonifatius, Gedenkgabe zum zwölfh. Todestag*, Fulda [1954], 473-87).

49. *S.* 16, n. 1 (PL 183: 849 AB); *S.* 17, n. 8 (859 A); *S.* 80, n. 1 (1166 BD). Cf. *In oct. paschae, s.* 1 (294 BD).

50. *S.* 23, n. 3: "And let us seek . . . the three of them in the Holy Scriptures: the garden, the storeroom, and the cell. . . . Thus, let plain and simple history be the garden. Let the moral sense be the storeroom. Let the mystery of speculative contemplation be the cell" (PL 183: 885 D). *De triplici introd. in hortum* etc. (714-5). Likewise in *In Cant. cant. commentatio ex Bern.*, n. 31-2 (PL 184: 431-2). But the opposite order in n. 13-14 (418-9).

51. See above. But *In Gen.*, Bk. 5, c. 25-26, after mentioning history, has: "This place also builds up the evangelical man spiritually" *(allegoria);* then it goes on to say: "We are no less capable of deriving moral sweetness from this place" (PL 167: 380-1). *De div. off.*, Bk. 12, c. 1 (170: 315 AC); etc.

52. "Tractat de materia sua triplici modo divina Scriptura, secundum historiam, secundum allegoriam, secundum tropologiam." P. 1, Bk. 2, c. 3 (J. Châtillon [1958], 115); P. 2, Bk. 7, c. 23 (331).

53. (Pseudo-Hugh); *s.* 10 and 11 (PL 177: 920 C, 923 D); *S.* 90: "Sacred Scripture . . . has bestowed one source of refreshing nourishment on us through history, another through allegory, and yet another through tropology" (1182 C).

54. *In Joel.* (PL 175: 323-35 etc.); "Historically, allegorically, morally" (351). But also: "The letter can be understood in accord with a threefold approach. . . . There are three kinds of doctrine. If, indeed, the moral kind shapes an empty life, the allegorical kind illuminates shapeless knowledge. The contemplative kind elevates one to a wisdom that is beyond the realm of notions. Otherwise put: the historical condition is water, moral doctrine is milk, and spiritual edification is sweetness" (388-9). *In Abdiam* (389 AD). The authenticity, though, of these two writings is disputed.

55. Bk. 1, c. 18, concerning Belshazzar's vision in Daniel: no one is permitted to be ignorant of its historical and allegorical sense, "but we discuss these matters both for our edification and that of others by referring to the moral sense, and we do so in such a manner that we do not presume to diminish or attenuate anything when it comes to dealing with so great and authoritative a mystery in a way that accords with a more hallowed understanding" (PL 191: 1260 D).

56. "Post historiam cognitam debemus quaerere moralitatem; similiter post istam, per allegoriae cognitionem proficimus ad anagogen." PL 196: 370 A.

57. *Serm. centum.*, Bk. 3: historically, tropologically, and anagogically (PL 177: 901-7).

58. *Benj. maj.*, Bk. 4, c. 24 (PL 196: 151 C). Nevertheless, at the beginning of the work, which is a discussion of Noah's ark, Richard says that many doctors have already shown "what this ark designates spiritually according to the allegorical sense" (= Christ) and that he now wants to add something "in the way of morality": Bk. 1, c. 1 (63 BC).

59. PL 196: 199-200. In *In ps. 118* Richard mentions the four senses again, in an order that is evidently arbitrary, but which is suggested to him by the comparison that has been drawn with the words of the text: "By the aforesaid four things, namely, gold, stone, honeycomb, and honey, we can quite justly understand the fourfold sense of Divine Scriptures, namely, the moral, anagogical, historical, and allegorical senses." (196: 351 D).

60. See above; and Lawrence's *Reportatio* (*RTAM*, 25, 276; O. Lottin).

61. *S.* 14: "The discerning division of the area on which we are now embarking is the one that we have in matters pertaining to the Word of God, when we attend carefully to what should be understood literally and what should have the mystical or moral sense applied to it. Indeed, as a result of this threefold understanding, while the soul is refreshed by these foods, as it were . . ." (PL 178: 494 AB).

62. Bk. 1, c. 29: "The House of God is either the Church, when we consider things allegorically, or our heavenly homeland, when we consider them anagogically, or the soul of man, when we consider them tropologically" (PL 98: 1062 B); "What is more, it has been possible to collect a great many ambrosial flowers from the golden meadows of Divine Scripture. Through them the beauty of Holy Church has been shown tropologically, allegorically, and anagogically" (1065 AB).

63. *Praeloquia*, Bk. 5, n. 2 (PL 136: 288 BC).

64. *In ps. 30:* "Therefore, Sacred Scripture is understood in an historical sense, as if it were the face of God considered in terms of its surface characteristics. The mystical and moral understanding is the hidden mystery of this face" (PL 193: 1301 A); *In ps. 56:* "They are fulfilled through an historical or parabolical notion of divine things, and illuminated through a mystical or moral knowledge of the same things" (1709 B); *In ps. 118:* "The divine proofs of truth in the Scriptures are to be investigated. The first ones to be investigated are the moral proofs and then the mystical proofs" (194: 731 C).

65. *Dial.* 2, c. 9: "in literal history, in moral doctrine, and in spiritual allegory" (PL 192: 1160 C, cf. 1161 A); *Dial.* 7, c. 11: "We run through Divine Scriptures by reading history and parables. Sometimes we draw a mystical sense from them, and when they have been examined carefully, we get a foretaste of the sweetness of morality. We are nourished by history and parables, we grow by means of allegory . . . we are fulfilled by morality, etc." (1243 CD).

66. PL 155: 170-2: "as concerns the letter, and morally, and also mystically"; 1722: "by way of mystery, for example"; 2035: "attending to the things that are said historically, mystically, tropologically, and anagogically."

67. On the one hand, *RTAM* (1931), 361; on the other hand, *s.* 31: "Beyond the moral sense, the mystical sense lies hidden under the aspect of the same parable" (PL 198: 1792-3; cf. 1054).

68. In *s.* 60 of the collection of Hildebert's writings, the theoretical account has "allegoria" coming before "moralitas," while, in the explanations that follow, it comes afterward (171: 634-5).

69. *Enarr. in ev. Matt.* (PL 162: 1229 ff.).

70. *In Ex.* 38, 20: "Holy Scripture, stable in its history, morality, and allegory" (PL 113: 293 BC).

71. *In Deut.*, 31, 30 (113: 487 D).

72. *In Cant., s.* 5: "intermingling words historically at times, at times allegorically, at other times tropologically, and still other times anagogically" (PL 202: 1274 B); but this seems to be said in a divided sense and not to be applicable to an understanding of one and the same text (see below, Chapter 3.2); C. 8: "now history feeds us, and moral allegory refreshes us, while, at other times, contemplation lifts us up to higher things" (1298 D).

73. *In Cant.* (PL 195: 1076 CD, 1243).

74. A. Hoste — J. Dubois, *SC.* 60.

75. *S.* 26: "three reeds . . . which is to say, the reeds of history, tropology, and allegory, a threefold understanding" (PL 211: 154 C); *S.* 39: "the historical sense, which equips us for truth; the moral sense, which shapes our will; the allegorical sense, which strengthens our faith; the anagogical sense, which lifts us on high toward contemplation" (227 B); *S.* 16: "a reverence for those four things, namely, history, tropology, anagogy, and allegory" (99 D); "history, tropology, allegory, and anagogy" (100 AB).

76. Thus *s.* 12 (PL 211: 76-7).

77. *In Cant.* (PL 172: 359-496).

78. "Verbum Dei in historico, morali, allegorico et anagogico sensu solet dividi." *S.* 11 (PL 205: 639 D).

79. "In primo celebremus Pascha historicum, in secundo allegoricum, in tertio tropologicum, in quarto anagogicum." *S.* 17 (686 A).

80. *S.* 21: "For there are some who are content with the historical text alone; others need to be steeped in faith through allegory; and still others need to be edified in their morals through tropology" (706 B).

81. "Nam sub eo sensu qui est in significatione vocum ad res, historia continetur . . . , sub eo vero sensu, qui est rerum ad facta mystica, continetur allegoria, et sub eo sensu qui est in rerum significatione ad facienda mystica, continetur tropologia." *S.* 34 (790 A).

82. *Itin. mentis in Deum,* c. 4, n. 6 (Q., 5, 307).

83. *Brevil. prol.,* n. 4 (5, 205), etc.

84. N. 5 (5, 321).

85. Coll. 2, n. 13-7: "allegory, anagogy, and tropology" (5, 238-9).

86. "quatuor theologicos intellectus," *S.* 4 (PL 217: 330 A); *s.* 18 (346 A); *L. de quadrup. specie nupt.* (923 A).

87. *L'art. rel. du XXe siècle en France,* 2d ed. (1924), 1.

Notes to Chapter Three
§1. Clement of Alexandria?

1. Translated into English from the German as *A History of Christian Doctrines*, 1 (1880), 125.

2. *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria* (2d ed., 1913), 86: "Clement speaks of four Senses of Scripture."

3. "Saint Ambrose as an Interpreter of Holy Scripture," *JTS* 16 (1914-5), 511: "There may be as many as four classes of meaning in a single passage, literal, mystic (i.e. allegorical), moral and prophetic."

4. *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers* (1956), 52-7.

5. *Stromata* 1, c. 28, 176-9 (Claude Mondésert — Marcel Caster, SC, 30, 1951, 173-4). The passages translated here are 176, 1-3a and 179, 3-4.

6. "in four ways" rather than "in three ways"

7. "hōs tupon tina dēlousan"

8. "Zur Textkritik des Clemens Alex. und Evagrios," *Theol. Literaturz.*, 56, 69-70.

9. *Anal. sacra*, 3, 109.

10. *Op. cit.*, 55, note.

11. *The Christian Platonists*, 57.

12. Mondésert, introd., 25.

13. "Hermeneutic problems in early Christian literature," *Vig. chr.* 1 (1947), 150-67.

14. P. 55: "This theological part of the Pentateuch reflects what Philo calls its prophetic part, and . . . one of the functions of prophecy is the prediction of things to come, whence Paul found in the Old Testament predictions of the coming of Christ." This amounts very quickly to everything being reduced to its common denominator.

15. *Strom.* 4, c. 1, 2-3 (St., 2, 248): "meta tēn epidromēn tēs theologias ta peri prophēteias paradedomena dialabein"

16. "ēthikē pragmateia"

17. "phusikē theōria"

18. Clement needs two terms to correspond with ethics: history and legal prescriptions. The comparison between liturgy and physics is forced. The same applies to the comparison between the "theological" genre of the Pentateuch and Aristotle's metaphysics or Plato's dialectic. In the unfolding that follows, "true dialectic" seems, moreover, to be the exercise of a faculty that is applied to the biblical text rather than a part of the content of the text.

19. "ontōs"

20. Such, at least, is the interpretation given by M. Hermaniuk, *La parabole évangélique* (1947), 427-8. It must be confessed that Clement's turn of phrase here does not make the meaning clear.

21. Hermaniuk, 427: historical genre, juridical genre, liturgical genre, and theological genre.

22. De Lubac cites the French translation of Caster, 174, which can be rendered into English as follows: "We have four ways of assimilating what the Law wills for us. Either it shows us a model, or it presents a thing symbolically, or it imposes it on us as a commandment for leading a decent life, or it prophesies, inasmuch as it assumes a prophetic role." De Lubac also cites the French translation of Hermaniuk, 372, which

can be rendered into English as follows: "The sentence of the Law ought to be understood in three ways: either as a sign, or as a precept . . . , or as a prophecy. . . ."

23. Which is what Wolfson wants to do, 56-7: "Clement formally divides all the senses of scriptural interpretation into two classes, the literal and allegorical, and subdivides the allegorical into three classes: the moral, physical, and theological . . . ; the combination of these two classifications yields a fourfold classification, namely: the literal, moral, physical, and theological senses."

24. See below, Chapter 3.2.

25. See above, Chapter 1.2. Origen, *In Cant. prol.* (75-9).

26. F. Sagnard (SC, 23, 190-1): ". . . ta men prōta tupikōs kai mustikōs, ta de hustera parabolikōs kai ēnigmenōs ta de trita saphōs kai gumnōs kata monas."

27. *The Christian Platonists*, 86, n. 2.

28. A comparison can be drawn, for example, with Menander the grammarian, who contrasts "the teaching of physics when it is hidden allegorically" and the same teaching when it is issued "clearly and transparently" (cited by J. Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie*, 87).

Notes to Chapter Three
§2. Saint Augustine?

1. "Omnis igitur Scriptura, quae Testamentum vetus vocatur, diligenter eam nosse cupientibus quadrifaria traditur: secundum historiam, secundum aetiologiam, secundum analogiam, secundum allegoriam. . . . Secundum aetiologiam, cum ostenditur qua de causa vel factum vel dictum sit. Secundum analogiam, cum demonstratur non sibi adversari duo Testamenta, vetus et novum Secundum allegoriam, cum docetur non ad litteram esse accipienda quaedam, quae scripta sunt, sed figurate intelligenda."

His omnibus modis Dominus noster Jesus Christus et Apostoli usi sunt . . . ." C. 3, n. 5-6 (PL 42: 68; Pegon, 216-28). Examples follow.

2. Thus n. 9 (228): "And the order of things is diligently presented — and the causes of words and deeds — and the harmony between the Old Testament and the New is so great that there is not the least little letter left in them that does not have a resounding echo — and figurative secrets so great that everything which is drawn forth by way of explanation compels those who want to condemn these things before they have even learned of them to confess that they are woefully wrong."

3. C. 3, n. 5: "Do not think that I am foolish when I use Greek words. In the first place, because this is the way I received this, I dare not communicate it to you in any other way than the way I received it. Also, you notice, too, that the names for these things are not customary in our language. If I had made them up by translating them, assuredly I would be even more foolish and impertinent. If, moreover, I approached them by circumlocution, I would be more hampered in my discussion" (218). Does this mean with certainty that these four words were "technical terms that were used by ecclesiastical authors" (Courcelle, 141)?

4. Alonso Tostado, *Commentaria in quartam partem Matthaei*, q. 28: "Those four senses which Augustine posits . . . three of them . . . are not impressed on the same literal passage, but in different passages. Accordingly Scripture has a threefold mode of proceeding. Which is to say that it sometimes proceeds by narration, sometimes by

rendering the causes of what is being narrated, and sometimes by adducing concordances" (Venice, 1615, 86).

5. Cf. Cassiodorus: "etiology, that is, a rendering of the cause." He gives an example of etiology in the Old Testament: *In ps. 113*, n. 10 (250, 98: 1031-2).

6. Nearly the same kind of thing will be said about *allegoria*. It seems that this is the only possible meaning of the text that has just been quoted: "when it is shown . . . when it is explained . . . when it is taught. . . ." This also comes out of the examples that have been given. But the ambiguity arises from the fact that Augustine, instead of commenting himself, at his own risk, as it were, on certain texts of the Old Testament, takes refuge in the exegeses provided by Jesus or Paul: the exegesis of the sacred text (the Old Testament) is thus itself, in this case, a sacred text (the New Testament).

7. Tostado, *ibid.*: "Those four senses which Augustine posits are reduced to the four mentioned above. For three of them, namely, history, etiology, and analogy, pertain to the literal sense. And the fourth, namely, allegory, contains three mystic senses."

8. 2d edition (1576), 147. Cf. *De vera religione*, c. 1 (Pegon, 168).

9. "Tres primi sensus intelliguntur et comprehenduntur sub sensu litterali. . . . Quartus vero sensus comprehendit tres spirituales." *Summa th., intr.*, q. 1, a. 4, ad 3m.

10. "Illa tria . . . historia, aetiologia, analogia ad unum litteralem sensum pertinent. . . . Sola autem allegoria inter illa quatuor pro tribus spiritualibus sensibus ponitur." Prima, q. 1, a. 10, ad 2m. Cf. the Response to the Letter of the Minorite in the *Prolegomena* to the *Glossa ordinaria:* "I do not believe that it escapes you that, according to Augustine in his *De utilitate credendi*, the literal sense is divided into three kinds" (PL 113: 57 CD).

11. "quaedam"

12. "figurate intelligenda"

13. "Augustinus dividit sensum litteralem in quatuor." *De summo bono*, 57.

14. "figurarum tanta secreta, ut omnia quae interpretando eruuntur, miseros esse cogant fateri, qui haec volunt ante condemnare, quam discere"

15. *De utilitate credendi*, c. 3, n. 8-9 (Pegon, 223-8); "In the gospel our Liberator himself uses allegory based on the Old Testament." Augustine cites Galatians 4:22-6 once again.

16. "qua utriusque Testamenti congruentia perspicitur"

17. This is what makes an appearance once more incontestably in n. 9, where Augustine comments on the texts of Saint Paul: "For the written code kills, but the Spirit gives life. . . . In your reading of the Old Testament that very same veil remains and is not lifted, for it is laid aside only in Christ. . . . When, moreover, you turn to Christ, the veil will be taken away" (2 Cor. 3:6, 14, 16; PL 42: 71; Pegon, 228).

18. "ad litteram"

19. An analogous remark needs to be made concerning etiology. The example that Augustine gives of it does not arise from the literal sense. But it can happen that the "grounds" by which a text (or a fact or an institution) of the Old Testament is justified may be its spiritual or "allegorical" significance. This is what Augustine himself does, in *In ps. 66*, n. 10: "Our youth will be renewed like that of the eagle; only let us dash our age against the rock that is Christ. Whether the things that are said of the serpent or of the eagle, brothers, are true, or whether it is the hearsay of men rather than truth, the truth, however, resides in the Scriptures, and it is not without reason that the Scriptures have said this etc." (250, 39: 867-8). Origen had the habit of introducing his spiritual explanations by such formulas; *In Gen.*, h. 12, n. 1: "what they contain in the

way of mystery and causation" (107); *In Lev.*, h. 8, n. 2-3: "First, let us consider things historically. . . . Now, indeed, let us ask that other question as well, what there is by way of cause that . . ." (394, 396); *In Num.*, h. 25, n. 3: "I think that Divine Scripture did not relate these names historically, but introduced them rather in terms of causation"; h. 27, n. 3: "Consider the reason for the mystery" (235, 259), etc. Cf. Rupert, *In Matt.*, Bk. 13: "The reason why God did all these things was hidden in God, and that is why this reason is rightly called a sacred mystery" (PL 168: 1624 C). Hugh introduces a mystical sense when he says, in *De arca myst.*, c. 1: "If you seek a reason for this thing . . ." (176: 681 C).

20. ". . . Quatuor modi a quibusdam Scripturarum tractatoribus traduntur Legis exponendae, quorum vocabula enuntiari graece possunt, latine autem definiri et explicari: secundum historiam, secundum allegoriam, secundum analogiam, secundum aetiologiam. Historia est, cum sive divinitus sive humanitus res gesta commemoratur. Allegoria, cum figurate dicta intelliguntur. Analogia, cum veteris et novi Testamentorum congruentia demonstratur. Aetiologia, cum dictorum factorumque causae reduntur.

Hoc ergo quod scriptum est, 'In principio fecit Deus caelum et terram," quaeri potest: utrum tantummodo secundum historiam accipiendum sit; an etiam figurate aliquid significet; et quomodo congruat evangelio; et qua causa liber iste sic inchoatus sit. . . ." C. 2, n. 5; c. 3, n. 6 (PL 34: 222).

21. "ad idem redeunt," Tostado, 83-6: Certain folk say that Augustine's four senses "are at variance with those four"; nevertheless, in the final analysis, "they amount to the same thing." Sixtus of Siena, *Bibliotheca sancta*, Bk. 3, c. 3; Vasquez, *In Primam*, q. 1, a. 10, disp. 16, c. 2. Erasmus comments at length on the text of the *De utilitate credendi* in *Ecclesiastes*, Bk. 3 (832-5). Cf. Fr. Ruizio, *Regulae intelligendi sacras Scripturas* (1599), reg. 46 (33-4).

22. "In omnibus libris sanctis oportet intueri quae ibi aeterna intimentur, quae ibi facta narrentur, quae futura praenuntientur, quae gerenda (agenda) praecipiantur aut moneantur." Bk. 1, c. 1, n. 1 (PL 34: 247).

23. "quadriformis ratio," *De tab.*, Bk. 1, c. 6 (PL 91: 410).

24. *In Ex.*, Bk. 3, c. 11 (PL 108: 147).

25. *Quodl.* 7, q. 6, a. 15, sed contra.

26. Thus we find J. M. de Turre, O.P., *Institutiones ad Verbi Dei intelligentiam*, 3 (1711), 20.

27. Which is why, immediately after the quoted words, we find: "Therefore, when it comes to recounting the deeds that have been done, the question is asked whether everything is understood only according to a figurative understanding, or whether, as well, everything should be affirmed and defended in accordance with the truth of events. For no Christian would dare to say that they are not to be understood figuratively, for he must hearken to the Apostle, who says: 'All these matters were related figuratively to those'; and the Apostle also commends what was written in Genesis, 'And the two of them will be one flesh', as the great sacrament of Christ and his Church" (34: 247). At that point, in n. 2, Augustine comes to his text: "If, then, Scripture is to be examined in both ways, let us inquire how it is that the following words are said in a way that goes beyond just their allegorical significance: 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth . . .'" *(ibid.)*.

28. *Bibliotheca theol.*, Bk. 3, sect. 1, c. 103: "In those words of his, however, he says

nothing about a mystical or literal sense. But he only enumerates the various headings to which everything which is contained in the Scriptures can be reduced" (2, Rome, 1667, 461).

29. Thus Perrone, *De locis th.*, Bk. 2, *s.* 1, c. 3: "But with these words the Holy Doctor in no wise recalls the diverse senses of Scripture, but rather he separates into parts the whole body of its subject matter" (Turin, 1865, 102, note). P. C. Boeren, however, speaks, in *La vie et les oeuvres de Guiard de Laon* (1956), 166, of: "the fourfold division on the part of the grammarians and exegetes of the school of Augustine."

30. "Legis quidem unum nomen est, sed tripartitam habet intelligentiam." C. 19.

31. "species dictionis"

32. "nam aut historica est, aut prophetica, aut proverbialis, aut simpliciter docens," *De part. div. legis*, Bk. 1, c. 2 (PL 68: 15-6). Cf. Cassian, below.

33. *De fide* (Peiper, 178).

34. "de sex modis intelligentiae"

35. PL 70: 1122-3.

36. "ratio tripertita"

37. "tantummodo secundum litteram sine ulla figurali intentione"

38. "salva historica rerum narratione, mystica ratione intelligitur," *De ord. creaturarum*, c. 10, n. 4-7 (PL 83: 939-40); "These deeds were done historically, and through an understanding of them the mysteries of the Church are indicated." On the origin of this work, wrongly attributed to Saint Isidore: M. C. Diaz, *S. Er.*, 5 (1953), 147-66.

39. "trimodum intelligentiae genus," *Differentiae*, Bk. 2, n. 154-5: "Prudence is a recognition of the true faith and a knowledge of the Scriptures, whereby that threefold mode of understanding needs to be considered. The first of these three understandings entails that certain things, such as the Ten Commandments, for instance, are understood historically without any figurative dimension. The second mode of understanding entails that certain things in the Scriptures are understood in a mixed way, as much in accordance with the end term (truth) of the deeds done as according to a figurative understanding as well, just as Sarah and Hagar. . . . The third mode is one that is only understood spiritually" (PL 83: 94-5). This is the classic division, such as can be found, for example, in Chrysostom, *In ps. 9*, n. 4 (PG 55: 208-9), or *In ps. 46*, n. 1 (209).

40. Bk. 1, c. 17 (PL 98: 1044-5). These are the first three "modi" of Primasius.

41. "Tripartita itaque reperiuntur prophetarum eloquia, siquidem aliqua sunt ad terrenam Hierusalem spectantia, aliqua ad caelestem, nonnulla ad utramque." *In Reg.*, Bk. 2 (PL 50: 1083 A).

42. "Tam veteris quam novi Testamenti tripertita est doctrina."

43. "tripertita disciplina," *In Rom. prol.* (PL 178: 783-4).

44. *In Lev.* (177 G).

45. *In ps. scl.* (PL 172: 273 C). Nor would we say that these are "five methods of interpreting Scripture"; at the very least it complicates the issue to present them as such. Cf. Eva Matthews Sanford, "Honorius presbyter and scholasticus," *Speculum* 23 (1948), 408.

46. "Quatuor sensus non litterales, quatuor modis fieri subtiliter explicat." C. 17 (*Op. omnia* [Paris], 1674, 48-9). Our four senses, however, are mentioned therein on p. 48, 2.

47. "In sacro eloquio intelligentiae magna discretio est. Saepe enim in quibusdam locis illius et historia servanda est et allegoria; et saepe in quibusdam sola exquirenda

est allegoria, aliquando vero sola necesse est ut teneatur historia. Nam in quibusdam locis . . . historia simul tenenda est et allegoria, ut et tardiores pascantur per historiam et velociores ingenio per allegoriam." *In Ex.*, Bk. 2, c. 15 (PL 108: 106 BC). Cf. *In Deut.*, Bk. 3, c. 12: "Thus there are certain places in the divine testaments which give a historical tincture to the truth of the faith. There are some places which give moral training for a social intercourse which is holy. There are some also which show, not historically, but allegorically, what should be hallowed with mystery. But in all these instances the conscientious reader needs to exercise the greatest of discernment, so that in these wheatfields of the Lord he may carefully seek out healthy pasture and not, however, fall prey, in his rashness, to the sentence of judgment that belongs to a bad harvest" (935 A).

48. *Conf. fidei*, p. 3, c. 36 (PL 101: 1080 A).

49. *De scripturis*, c. 4 (PL 175: 12-3).

50. *Resp. de damnat. Sal.*: "In very truth, a threefold mode of understanding can be found not only in the prophetic books, but in all of that part of Scripture which is called the Old Testament. Thus it is that in the Old Testament some things can appropriately be understood just literally, some only spiritually, and some things by means of both these modes at once" (PL 203: 625 AB). This text is related to that of Claudius.

51. *Loc. cit.*, n. 35.

52. PL 113: 479 B (*In Deut.*, 23:25) and 748.

53. "Cum igitur constet has quatuor . . . intelligentias, omne quod ei (Scripturae) inest secretum revelare, nobis considerandum est quando secundum unam solum, quando secundum duas, quando secundum tres, quando etiam secundum omnes simul quatuor intelligi velit." *All. in univ. Scripturam* (PL 112: 850 A).

54. "Tropologia, id est, moralis locutio . . . , sive apertis sive figuratis prolata sermonibus," *In Ex.*, Bk. 3, c. 11 (PL 108: 148 A); etc.

55. "Anagoge est, cum vel apertis verbis, vel figuratis, de caelestis vitae praemiis disputatur." Thus in "Alterc. Syn. et Eccl." (J. Chatillon, *RTAM*, 23, 52, n. 36).

56. "Sciendum vero est quod quaedam historica expositione transcurrimus, et per allegoriam quaedam typica investigatione perscrutamur; quaedam per sola allegoricae moralitatis instrumenta discutimus; nonnulla autem per cuncta simul sollicitius exquirentes, tripliciter indagamus." *Mor., Ep. miss.*, c. 3 (PL 75: 513). A text that is ambiguous as well: Gregory does not make it clear whether he will let himself be guided in this way by a more or less subjective choice or whether these different choices correspond, in fact, to different categories of texts. I believe that, in order to be faithful to his thought, it is proper not to seek to become more specific. The same applies for the triple "mode" of *Mor.*, Bk. 16, c. 19, n. 24 (75: 1132 B). In his *Cronica*, Salimbene will once again interweave the question of the senses of Scripture to that of its fourfold usefulness, according to 2 Timothy 3:16, "for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness": "When, therefore, the Apostle posits a fourfold usefulness of Divine Scripture in this passage, it is clear that those who try to hem Scripture into the confines of its literal usefulness only are in error. . . . Thus it is clear . . . that Divine Scripture requires another kind of understanding, beyond just the literal" (MGH, *Scr.*, 32, 249-50).

57. "trimodum intelligentiae genus"

58. C. 9, n. 3-5 (Vega-Anspach, 29-31).

59. "modus Scripturae," "multiplex"

60. *Tr. intr.*, q. 1, a. 3 (Q., 1, 10-1).

61. R. Loewe's expression regarding the *De utilitate credendi*, 3, 5 (*St. patr.*, 1, 503, note).

62. "Distinguamus . . . qui sit modus interpretandae allegoriae, quae per sapientiam dicta creditur in Spiritu sancto: utrum a visibilibus antiquioribus ad visibilia recentiora eam perducere sufficiat, an usque ad animae affectiones atque naturam, an usque ad incommutabilem aeternitatem; an aliae significent gesta visibilia, aliae motus animorum, aliae legem aeternitatis; an aliqua inveniantur, in quibus haec omnia vestiganda sint." *De vera religione*, c. 50, n. 99 (PL 42: 166); in *Dom. de la Trinité*, 461. Cf. *In ps. 8*, n. 5 (36, 110-1), etc.

Notes to Chapter Three
§3. Gregory, Cassian, and Eucher

1. "typica investigatio" or "significatio typica"

2. "historica expositio"

3. "fundamentum historiae," "spiritalis intelligentia allegoriae," "moralitatis gratia," "intelligentia contemplativa," *Mor. Ep. miss.*, c. 3 (R. Gillet, A. de Gaudemaris, SC, 32, 118); *In ev.*, h. 40, n. 1 (PL 76: 1302 A).

4. A few exceptions: *In Ez.*, Bk. 2, h. 9, n. 5: "But because we have spoken of these matters in terms of morals, the task remains for us yet of researching the same portions through an understanding according to types" (PL 76: 1045 C), h. 2, n. 1 (949 BC), Bk. 1, 4-7, n. 8 (843 C); *Mor.* Bk. 16, c. 19, n. 24 (75: 1132 B); *In 1 Reg.*, Bk. 2, c. 1, n. 28 (79: 89 D).

5. "Quia allegoriae mysteria membratim enodantes explevimus, nunc moralitatis intelligentiam raptim tangentes exsequamur." *Mor.*, Bk. 3, c. 26, n. 58 (PL 75: 627 A).

6. "Haec sub intellectu mystico brevi locutione transcurrimus. . . . Restat ut . . . virtutem sensuum moraliter inquiramus." *Op. cit.*, Bk. 6, c. 5, n. 6 (732 CD).

7. Cf. the remarks of B. Smalley, 34: "Everything in St. Gregory's teaching is attached, however loosely, to the thread of the text, which precludes any attempt at coherence or logical arrangement. But if we take a series of two or three homilies, or one of the thirty-five books of the *Moralia*, we can see how suitable it was for educational purposes. In two or three addresses, or hours of study, St. Gregory's hearers or readers would get a series of lessons on doctrine, prayer and ethics, in a well-arranged and carefully varied timetable." Sixtus of Siena had a good appreciation of this order and its logic, in *Biblioth. sancta*, Bk. 4 (2d ed., Cologne, 1576), 253-4.

8. ". . . ut non solum verba historiae per allegoriarum sensus excuterem, sed allegoriarum sensus protinus in exercitium moralitatis inclinarem." *Ep. miss.*, c. 1 (SC 32, 116); c. 2: "a service of explanation — a contemplative ascent — an instrument of morality" (117); this has been well translated by Dom de Gaudemaris: "literal exegesis — the more elevated interpretation given by contemplation — a moral lesson." As for the word "allegoria" itself, Gregory sometimes makes it synonymous with the second sense, while at other times he unites the second and third senses under it. That is why he speaks of "allegorica moralitas" [= "allegorical morality"] (75: 513 C).

9. "Cum suavis sit in superficie litterae, altior in typis allegoriae, moribus instruendis utilis, lucida in exemplis adhibendis — in locis tamen singulis et historica asserere,

et typica proferre, *et conferre moralia, et proponere exempla refugio,* quanquam alia sub uno intellectu, adjuvante Domino, sim expositurus, alia vero sub pluribus." *In 1 Reg., proem.*, n. 4 (PL 79: 20 C). Although the work was not revised by Gregory, it is quite authentic: Patrik Verbraken, *RB* 66 (1956), 159-217.

10. *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, h. 7, n. 8: "The animals walk, when the holy men in Sacred Scripture understand how morally they live. The animals rise from the earth, when the holy men are suspended in contemplation" (PL 76: 843 C); *Moralia,* Bk. 16, c. 19, n. 24: "so that at times bare, unadorned history might feed us, at other times . . . moral allegory might refresh us, and at yet other times contemplation might prop us up in aspiring to the heights" (75: 1132 BC). (See above, Chapter 3.2, n. 50).

11. "Verba etenim Scripturae sacrae lapides quadri sunt. . . . Nam in omne quod praeteritum narrant, in omne quod venturum annuntiant, in omne quod moraliter praedicant, in omne quod spiritaliter sonant, quasi in diverso latere statum habent, quia reprehensionem non habent." *In Ez.*, Bk. 2, h. 9, n. 8 (76: 1047 B).

12. "quomodo juxta litteram intelligendus, qualiter ad Christi Ecclesiaeque sacramenta referendus, quo sensu unicuique fidelium sit aptandus." *S. Gregorii magni Vita, auctore Paulo diacono assinensi,* c. 8 (PL 75: 45 AB). A text taken up by Bede, *Hist. eccl.*, c. 1 (492 D). Cf. Paterius, *proem.* (79: 683 A). Symeon Metaphrastes: "He explicated the Book of Job in a threefold manner: historically, allegorically, and morally" (75: 498 C); likewise in Sigebert of Gembloux, *De script. eccl.*, c. 41 (160, 557 A). Yet again in Vincent of Beauvais, *Spec. historiale,* Bk. 22, c. 24 (éd. de Douai, 4 [1624], 868).

13. "ita ut super historiae fundamentum moralitatis construeret aedificium, et anagoges imposuerit culmen praestantissimum." *De interp. div. Script.*, c. 3 (PL 131: 996 D).

14. On Gregory's authority on this matter in the Middle Ages: see below, c. 8, 5. Cf. S. Berger, *op. cit.*, 26: "In his *Morales* Saint Gregory has left the ages that followed him a perpetual example of the fourfold sense of words." This is a just statement, except for the restriction implied by the last two words. In his *Bibl. sancta,* Bk. 4 (2d ed. [1576], 253), Sixtus of Siena observes that allegory and anagogy "amount to the same thing in his work."

15. "Haec ergo praenuntiata sunt, quae consummata agnoscimus in Domini sepultura. . . . Sed amplius haec ad animam referenda sunt, id est ad moralem sensum." *In Cant.*, Bk. 5 (89); Bk. 7 (127-8).

16. At Saint Victor in the twelfth century, Cassian was read each day: Baron, *Sc. et sag. chez H. de SV,* 170. On the readers and imitators of Cassian, from Gregory to Saint Bernard: Cappuyns, *DHGE,* 11, 1343.

17. *Coll.* 8, c. 3: "Appropriately enough, Divine Scripture is compared to a rich and fertile field. . . . We see clearly enough that this kind of reckoning is in the province of that very rich paradise that is the spiritual Scriptures:

1. In this paradise certain things shine so bright and clear in their literal significance that . . . they feed and nourish their hearers abundantly with the simple notes that are struck by the literal aspect alone. . . .
2. With respect to certain other things, if they are not diminished and made manageable by an allegorical explanation . . . , there is no way that they can come to be the saving food of the inner man without the stain of corruption.
3. Some matters are so easily and necessarily understood by way of both these

perceptions, that is to say, the historical perception no less than the allegorical one, that both explanations lend their aid to the vital functions of the soul. . . .

4. Indeed Scripture produces "hay for the draught animals." All the fields of Scripture are full of this fodder, which is, to be sure, the pure and simple narration of the historical text, whereby those who are simpler and less capable of a whole and perfect reasoning . . . are rendered more vigorous and strong for the laborious work of practical life in accordance with their state in life and the measure of their abilities" (E. Pichery, SC, 54, 11-2).

18. As with Saint Augustine, note the words "quaedam" [= "certain things"] and "nonnulla" [= "some things"].

19. "certo ordine ac ratione subsistit"

20. *Coll.* 14, c. 1-2 (SC 54, 183-4). Chapters 3-7 expound the things that touch on "practical science" (84-9). Cf. c. 14: "For truly it is impossible for an unclean soul to attain spiritual knowledge, however much it perseveres and toils in the task of reading" (202); c. 16: "For we mentioned before that men who dispute in this way have only experience and skill in stylish elocution, but they cannot enter into the secret channels of Scripture and its spiritual senses" (203); etc.

21. "historica interpretatio"

22. "intelligentia spiritalis"

23. "tropologia, allegoria, anagoge," *Coll.* 14, c. 8 (SC 54: 189-92).

24. *Ibid.*: "The Blessed Apostle speaks thus of these four kinds of interpretations: 'How shall I benefit you unless I bring you some revelation or knowledge or prophecy or teaching?' (1 Cor. 14:6) . . ." (191). A page reproduced to the letter by Rabanus in his commentary on 1 Cor. (PL 112: 130 AD). The same explication is to be found in Sed. Sc. (59: 155 CD).

25. C. 9, n. 5 (Vega-Anspach, 31).

26. "For truly revelation pertains to allegory. Through revelation the things that are read by historical narration are revealed by means of a spiritual sense and explanation; so that . . . if we should try to unlock how it was that 'all our fathers were under a cloud . . .' and how it was that 'all ate the same spiritual food etc.'. This exposition, when compared with the prefiguration of the body and blood of Christ which we consume daily, contains allegorical reasoning" (SC 54, 191).

27. "Simplicem historiae expositionis ordinem pandit, in qua nullus occultior intellectus, nisi qui verbis resonat, continetur."

28. First of all we have: historia, tropologia, allegoria, anagoge; then we have: historia, allegoria, anagoge, tropologia; and lastly there are: allegoria, tropologia, anagoge, historia. The third order, imposed by the parallelism that was sought with the four words of Saint Paul, has nothing significant, and, as has been said, no longer concerns, strictly speaking, the doctrine of the senses of Scripture.

29. "Corpus ergo Scripturae sacrae, sicut traditur, in littera est, anima in morali sensu, qui tropicus dicitur, spiritus in superiore intellectu, qui anagoge appellatur. Quam triplicem Scripturarum regulam convenienter observat confessio sanctae Trinitatis, 'sanctificans nos per omnia, ut integer spiritus noster et anima et corpus sine querela in adventum Domini nostri Jesu Christi judiciumque servetur" (1 Thess. 5:24).

Sapientia mundi hujus philosophiam suam in tres partes divisit, physicam, ethicam, logicam, id est naturalem, moralem, rationalem; sed naturalem illam pertinentem

ad causas naturae, quae universa contineat; moralem, vero, quae respiciat ad mores; rationalem autem, quae de sublimioribus disputans, Deum omnium patrem esse confirmet. Quam tripertitam doctrinae distributionem non adeo abhorret illa nostrorum in disputatione distinctio, qua docti quique hanc caelestem Scripturarum Philosophiam secundum historiam, secundum tropologiam, secundum anagogen disserendam putant. Quapropter historia veritatem nobis factorum ac fidem relationis inculcat. Tropologia ad vitae emendationem mysticos intellectus refert. Anagoge ad sacratiora caelestium figurarum secreta perducit." "Praefatio" (C. Wotke, 5). The work is dedicated to his second son, the bishop of Vence. On Eucher see: Elie Griffe's *La Gaule chrétienne à l'ép. romaine*, 2 (1957), 228-30.

30. *Ep.* 89.

31. *Inst. orat.*, Bk. 12, c. 2.

32. *Civ. Dei*, Bk. 8, c. 4; Bk. 11, c. 25 (PL 41: 227-9, 338-9).

33. This plurality was already implicit in Origen, *In Cant. proem.* See below, Chapter 3.5.

34. "non adeo abhorret"

35. Augustine had subjected the classical theory to a profound transformation: *De vera rel.*, c. 16, n. 30 to c. 17, n. 34 (Pegon, 62-8; cf. Jean Clémence's note, 488-9).

36. *Ep.* 120, *ad Hebrid.*, q. 12 (6, 162); *ep.* 30, c. 1 (2, 31); *In Eccl.*, Bk. 1 (PL 23: 1012 C); *In Is.*, Bk. 7, *praef.* (24: 19 A); *C. Pelag.*, Bk. 1, n. 21 (23: 514 C). Cf. Claudius. *In Gen.*, Bk. 2 (51: 986 C).

37. "Triplex in corde nostro descriptio et regula Scripturarum est: prima, ut intelligamus eas juxta historiam; secunda, juxta tropologiam; tertia, juxta intelligentiam spiritalem. . . . Quos tales Christus invenerit, ut et corpore et anima et spiritu integri conserventur et perfectam habeant triplicis in se scientiae veritatem, hos sua pace sanctificabit, et faciet esse perfectos." *In Ez.*, Bk. 5, c. 16: "Behold, we are bidden to understand the eloquence of truth, that is to say, the Sacred Scriptures, in a threefold way: first literally, secondly in a middling way through tropology, and thirdly in a more lofty manner so that we come to recognize all its mystical elements" (PL 25: 147-8).

38. "Hoc enim primum intellegere vos oportet, quod omnis Scriptura in omne quod dicitur aut loquitur, triformi intellectus opera divisa, aut mundi in nobis opus destruens terrenae carnis in concupiscentiis castigat habitaculum . . . ; aut divinum animae genus repetens ea quae in nobis dierum, mensuum, temporum, voluntatum et idolicis terrenae nativitatis vitiis districta videntur informat . . . ; aut certe Deum in homine cottidianum sui testem passum pro nobis et nostri judicem monstrat: ut, quia nos divinae consortes esse voluit naturae, ita nos corpore, anima et spiritu, triformi praeceptorum observatione distringat . . . ," Tr. 6 (G. Schepss, 70); "in body, soul, and spirit, wherein man is renewed through the threefold rule of the decalogue in us" (78). The treatises that are attributed to Priscillian may have been written by a disciple named Instantius (A. d'Alès, *Priscillien* . . . [1936], 75-117).

39. For example, Ambrose, *De Cain et Abel*, Bk. 2, c. 1, n. 6: "We consist of soul, body, and spirit" (PL 24: 342 A); Damasus, *Ep.* 6 (*Ad Const.*; 507); Augustine, *De orig. animae*, Bk. 1, n. 28; Bk. 4, n. 3 (PL 44: 490, 525); *In ps. 118, s.* 12, n. 1: "To be sure, all of that spiritual, animal, and corporeal creation is in man" (CCL: 40, 1700); etc.

40. *Differ.*, Bk. 2, c. 30, n. 98-108 (PL 83: 84-6). Cf. Hugh (176: 631).

41. 1 Thessalonians 5:23. Cf. Hebrews 4:12; Jude 19, etc. — It happens that this idea

is confused with the Platonic division of the soul into three parts, which is itself also frequent in patristic works.

42. Thus Gr. d'Elv., Tr. 12 (135).

43. Gregory Nazianzen, *Disc.* 4, c. 118-9 (PG 35: 657-8). Concerning the philosophical explication of the pagan myths and Christian exegesis.

44. Cf. Eusebius, *H.E.*, Bk. 2, c. 17, n. 10-11, on the Therapeutae (Bardy, SC, 31, 74).

45. The "sacramental Platonism" of Theodore of Mopsuestia in his *Catechetical Sermons* has been noted. Father J. Daniélou sees this as a consequence of his exegetical literalism: *Bible et liturgie* (1951), 21.

46. Filastre, *Haer.* 127 (Fr. Marx, 130): "according to the letter — according to intelligible reasoning." There are numerous examples in the Latin tradition of Hesychius of Jerusalem, *In Lev.:* Bk. 7: "the intelligible things of God's Scripture" (PG 93: 1153 C).

47. Thus Rabanus, *In Ex.*: "the intellectual Jerusalem" (PL 108: 196 B); P. Lombard, *In 1 Cor.:* "the intelligible significance" (PL 191: 1619 D); etc.

48. "veritas factorum," "fides relationis"

49. "abscondita Scripturarum"

50. 1 Corinthians 2:16, which should be compared with 2:10-15.

51. *In Cant., s.* 58, n. 4: "intelligible vineyards, that is to say, souls or churches" (PL 183: 1057 C).

52. θεωρία κατὰ τὸν νοῦν [= "theōria kata ton noun"], *In Cant. proem.* (PG 44: 757).

53. τὰ νοητὰ ἐκδεχόμενοι [= "ta noēta ekdechomenoi"], *In ps. 50,* n. 1 (PG 55: 209).

54. τῶν ἱστορουμενῶν τὰ νοούμενα [= "tōn historoumenōn ta nooumena"], *Quaest. ad Thal.* 37 (PG 90: 385 B).

55. "scholasticus sermo." Cf. Gennadius, *De script. eccl.*, c. 63 (PL 58: 1096-7).

56. "disciplina nostrae religionis"

57. Compare Wotke, 5-6 and PL 49: 954-5. The idea came from Evagrius. Courcelle, 218. Can it be guaranteed for all that that the method extolled by Eucher "is the Greek scholastic method of Evagrius as transmitted by Cassian"? Conclusive for the practical and theoretical (Evagrius: "pneumatic") division of the sciences, the parallel with Evagrius is less so perhaps in terms of the application that is made to Scripture, and a fortiori less so for the application made to the threefold sense. Nevertheless, this is not very important, since one can go back further than Evagrius, as we shall see.

58. "Sunt etiam qui allegoriam in hoc scientiae genere quarto in loco adjiciendam putent, quam gestorum narrationem, futurorum umbram praetulisse confirment."

59. "Let these matters be made more clear through the following patterns: the heavens are what we consider historically, the heavenly life is tropological, allegorically the waters are baptism, and the angels are anagogical" (Wotke, 5).

Notes to Chapter Three
§4. Origen

1. *Dialektos,* citing 1 Thessalonians 5:23 and Romans 8:16 (Schérer, 137); *In Luc.*, h. 8 (Rauer, 55); *In Matt.*, vol. 13, n. 2 (Klost, 178), etc. Of this case, as of others, it can be said as Father Lagrange says, in *L'orphisme,* 216: "His method attests to a bias regarding the original independence of Christianity."

2. *In Jo.*, Bk. 32, c. 18 (455); *De princ.*, Bk. 2, c. 8, n. 4 (162); *idem:* Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*,

Bk. 5, c. 9, n. 1 (PG 7: 1144 B). Contrariwise, Origen rejects the Platonic trichotomy of the soul as something that is foreign to Scripture: *De princ.*, Bk. 3, c. 4, p. 1 (264).

3. Cf. HE (1950), especially 152.

4. *Periarc.*, Bk. 4.

5. ". . . Tripliciter ergo describere oportet in anima sua unumquemque divinarum intelligentiam Scripturarum, id est:

- ut simpliciores quique aedificentur ab ipso, ut ita dixerim, corpore Scripturarum (sic enim appellamus communem istum et historialem intellectum);
- si qui vero aliquantum jam proficere coeperunt et possunt amplius aliquid intueri, ab ipsa Scripturae anima aedificentur;
- qui vero perfecti sunt et similes his, de quibus Apostolus dicit: 'sapientiam autem loquimur inter perfectos, sapientiam vero non hujus saeculi neque principum hujus saeculi, qui destruentur, sed loquimur Dei sapientiam in mysterio absconditam, quam praedestinavit Deus ante saecula in gloriam nostram,' hi tales ab ipsa spiritali lege, quae 'umbram habet futurorum bonorum,' tanquam ab spiritu aedificentur.

Sicut ergo homo constare dicitur ex corpore et anima et spiritu, ita etiam sancta Scriptura, quae ad hominum salutem divina largitione concessa est." Bk. 4, c. 2, n. 4 (312-3); cf. n. 6 (315-8). It can be readily seen that it was not Eucher who "was the first to show how Scripture has a body, a soul, and a spirit," as was thought by S. Berger, in *La Bible au XVIe siècle*, 26.

6. "Cum igitur constet Scriptura quoque ipsa, velut ex corpore quod cernitur, et anima quae in ipso intelligitur et concipitur, et ex spiritu secundum exemplaria et umbram caelestium, age, eo invocato qui Scripturae corpus, animam et spiritum fecit, corpus iis qui nos praecesserunt, animam nobis, spiritum iis qui in futuro saeculo vitam aeternam possidebunt, et ad caelestia veritatemque legis venturi sunt: animam, non litteram, in praesenti investigemus; si vero tantam efficere possumus, juxta rationem sacrificiorum quae modo lecta sunt, ad spiritum ascendamus," PG 12: 412 CD; *Philoc.*, c. 30 (Robinson, 35-6; Baehrens, 322-4).

7. "prima litterae facies"

8. *In Num.*, h. 9, n. 7: "The firsthand literal aspect . . . secondly . . . a consideration of moral doctrine or continence is marked out . . . and in the third place . . . you will find the secret meaning of the mysteries of God's wisdom and knowledge" (63-4); H. 7, n. 1: "After this, moreover, let us leave behind morals and move on to a mystical understanding" (38); *In Lev.*, h. 5, n. 5: "For indeed we have often said that in the Divine Scriptures a threefold mode of understanding is to be found, namely, the historical, moral, and mystical. For this reason, we know that in Scripture there is a body, soul, and spirit" (344).

9. "In omnibus Scripturis triplicis hujus sacramenti ratio percurrit," *In Num.*, h. 9, n. 7 (64).

10. *A History of Christian Doctrines* (translation from the German), 1 (1880), 125.

11. *Les Pères de L'Église*, 1 (French translation, 1898), 265.

12. *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture* (1899), 449.

13. In *Biblica* (1925); *Scritti . . .*, 2, 320-1.

14. *Les sermons universitaires parisiens . . .* (1931), 57; with inexact terminology (body, spirit, soul); William of St. Thierry, *Commentaire sur le Cantique* (1958), intr., 12. Also E. Leigh-Bennett, *History of the Christian Fathers* (1920), 107.

15. *L'essor*, 1, 100.

16. Vol. 2, 303.

17. *Speculum* 4 (1929), 285.

18. *Sidoine Apollin. et l'esprit précieux en Gaule* (1943), 36.

19. *La parabole évang.* (1947), 446-7.

20. *Thought and Letters in Western Europe* (2d ed., 1957), 65.

21. *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine* (10th ed., 1954), 53.

22. *Hugonis de SV Theologia Perfectiva* (1956), 305.

23. *St. Patr.*, 1, 503, n. 1 (referring only to *Periarch.*, 4, 2, 4).

24. *The Mind of the Middle Ages* (3d ed., 1958), 71-2.

25. *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers* (1956), 57-63; but the nuances that are adduced have no bearing on essentials.

26. "Origène comme exégète de la Bible," *St. Patr.*, 1, 287: "Having as he does a Platonic vision as his point of departure," Origen "often interprets the scriptural symbols as allegories of moral realities. This is what he generally means by the 'moral' sense in his homilies. . . . All of this comes to a great extent from Philo." I believe that only the word "generally" is excessive and that in any case Origen does not designate this part of his exegesis as "spiritual exegesis" *(ibid.)*. In my opinion, there is a more accurate note in *Sacramentum futuri*, 212-3.

27. Article entitled "Origène," in F. Vigouroux's *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, 5 (1876). Similarly, G. Bardy, in *Initiation biblique* ([1939], 298; 3d ed. [1954], 458-9). There is, however, a bit of confusion in what is added by Prat, namely, that this conformed more readily "with Jewish tradition."

28. *Ibid.*, col. 1875: in that case "the moral sense, which is the soul of Scripture, occupies the third and loftiest rank." This is not entirely correct, for in this other schematic arrangement the body-soul analogy no longer plays a role. On the other hand, in this arrangement the third rank is not necessarily the loftiest one.

29. *Preface to the Works of Origen* (Basel, 1545), vol. 1.

30. "Attingit autem Origenes in homeliis . . . historicam explorationem, . . . sed ad altioris intelligentiae sensus ascendit, et ab his iterum ad locos morales et breves exhortationes descendit." *Bibl. sancta*, Bk. 4 (2d ed., 1576), 301: the remark alludes to the homilies, but not in a restrictive sense. Likewise, Stephan Wiest, Cist., *Introductio in historiam litter. theologiae revelatae* (1794), 128.

31. *Philologia sacra* (1711), 163.

32. "Interpretandis Scripturis (Origenes) triplex expositionis genus adhibuit; triplicem etiam ex illis sensum eruere ac investigare consuevit: historicum . . . , mysticum et moralem. Ab historico autem sensu ad mysticum, a mystico ad moralem fere progreditur; quanquam hunc ordinem nonnumquam immutet." *Script. eccl. hist. litteraria*, 1 (1741), 116.

33. "Prima (expositio), quae praecessit, historica est, velut fundamentum quoddam in inferioribus posita. Secunda haec mystica, superior et excelsior fuit. Tertiam, si possumus, moralem tentemus adjicere." H. 2, n. 6 (36).

34. H. 1, n. 4, on Exodus 1:6-7 (149-50).

35. H. 3, n. 3, on Exodus 3:18 (165-6).

36. As well as *In Gen.*, h. 11, n. 3 (104-6); h. 12, n. 3 (108-9); *In Ex.*, h. 4, n. 7-8 (179-82); h. 9, n. 3-4 (237-44); *In Lev.*, h. 1, n. 4-5 (285-8); h. 2, n. 3-4 (293-7); *In Num.*, h. 1, n. 2 (5-6); *In Jos.*, h. 8, n. 7: "Whether the city of the Lord is understood to be the

Church of the living God . . . , or whether we understand the city of the Lord to be the soul of each one of us" (342-5); *In Jud.*, h. 4, n. 4 (401); etc.

37. "Beatae sunt ergo animae quae sic Christum sequuntur, quomodo eas Christus praecessit." *In Jud.*, h. 7, n. 2 (508).

38. The same order obtains in *In Gen.*, h. 17, which could be authentic; n. 1: "This thing suggests to us a threefold theme by way of explanation, as we have done in other respects. This is so that the blessings may retain the place of history, prophecy a mystical and dogmatic place, and so that a reproving correction of morals may assume a moral style" (PG 12: 253 C); n. 9 (262 B).

39. *Cant. cant. Sal. versibus et commentariis illustratum* (1585), p. 24: "First of all, Origen refers to the Church that has been gathered together from the ranks of the gentiles, and then to every individual soul which is inclined to God and faith."

40. "tertia expositio," "tertius expositionis locus," Bk. 2: "Through the third exposition, what he says will be seen quite possibly to refer to every individual soul" (165). Bk. 3: "so that the third exposition, too, may have its categorical place, let the discourse be resumed for every individual soul" (206); etc.

41. PG 12: 1432.

42. "anima credentis"

43. "anima fidelis"

44. "anima ecclesiastica"

45. "anima in Ecclesia"

46. "Inter caetera ingenii sui praeclara monumenta, etiam in hoc laboravit, ut quod Philo quasi Judaeus omiserat, hic ut christianus impleret." *Liber de nom. hebr., praef.* (PL 23: 772 A).

47. Eusebius; *H.E.*, Bk. 2, c. 17 (SC, 31, 74). Cf. Keble, 58: Here Origen was "influenced perhaps by a desire to retain, together with the Christian interpretation, as much as he could of the morality which he admired in Philo."

48. *Philo*, 1 (2d ed., 1948), 115-38.

49. *An Introduction*, 57; and 63: "Clement and Origen made various efforts to classify the different senses. All these efforts are founded on Philo's division into literal and nonliteral senses, as well as on the no less Philonian division of the nonliteral sense into physical and ethical senses." There are two errors here:

1. Clement and Origen had no need of Philo to distinguish a literal sense from a nonliteral one. The whole Christian tradition professed this distinction.
2. The way in which they are subdivided is in no way reducible to the distinction between physical and ethical senses.

50. *In Cant. prol.* (78); or of "true philosophy" (76).

51. *Sel. in ps.* (PG 12: 1641 D).

52. *In Jer.*, fr. 14 (241).

53. *In Cant.*, prol. (75-80). Rufinus translates: moral, natural, and contemplative discipline. Cf. Jerome, *In Eccl.*: "let them first teach ethics, and then explain physics, leading the way even to logic, which they have observed to be of profit in these matters" (PL 23: 1012 C); there is a connection with the three degrees of the spiritual life (stripling, man of mature age, perfect man; beginners, those who are making progress, the perfect); the "logic" of "those who are perfect" consists of "the embraces of the Spouse" (1012-3).

54. We are not studying the quite complex later tradition, which concerns the

division of the sciences, its relationship to Scripture, and its combination with the theories of the threefold and fourfold senses. There are many who follow the same order as Origen. Thus, besides Gregory of Nyssa, Evagrius, and Maximus, there are Gregory the Great, John Scotus, Rupert, and also Jacques de Vitry (Pitra, *Anal. nov.*, 2, 371). Others put physics before morality. Thus we have Eucher, Cassiodorus, Virgil of Toulouse, Isidore, Christian of Stavelot, Ermenric of Elwangen, and Pierre of Poitiers. It may be that this series of writers was influenced by Quintilian (*Inst. orat.*, Bk. 12, c. 2). Origen's enoptics (or "inspectiva" [= "contemplation"]) often become "logic," having been assimilated to "theoria" or "theologia." The eclectic or variable formulas of Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine are good indicators that there was nothing essential here. In any case, we find that in all the different attempts at a harmonizing concordance "physics" was never attributed to the third sense any more so than it was so attributed in the work of Origen. Beyond every sort of classification, it is interesting to read the following in the work of Isidore (*Etym.*, Bk. 8, c. 6, n. 18): "Theologians are the same as those who study physics" (PL 82: 307 A); but it is a question here of pagan theologians, concerning whom Christian controversy, especially in the case of Augustine (*City of God*), gave a precise demonstration that they were in reality merely "physicists" or "physiologists."

55. " 'Odor unguentorum tuorum' — spiritalis scilicet intelligentia et mystica — 'super omnia aromata' moralis naturalisque philosophiae."

56. *On the Migration of Abraham, passim;* notably n. 17-32 (R. Cadiou, SC, 47, 28-32). On this exegesis: Cadiou, 8-11.

57. *Quaest. Gen.*, 1, 108. Other examples of a physical sense: the four wells of Isaac's servants are the four parts of the universe (*Somn.*, 1, 39); the two cherubim on the ark are the two hemispheres (*Vit. Mos.*, 2, 98). See below, Chapter 3.5.

58. *Allegories of the Sacred Laws*, Bk. 3, c. 33, n. 100: "But there is a more perfect and better purified understanding which is initiated in the great mysteries and which does not have a knowledge of the Cause according to its effects, as one knows an immobile object according to its shadow. This understanding has gone beyond becoming. It receives a clear and untrammeled appearance of unbegotten being."

59. We cannot expatiate here on Philo's exegesis. A good exposition of it can be found in J. Daniélou's *Philon d'Alex.* (1957), 119-42; on the exegetical crosscurrents of his time: 102-9.

60. Cf. Colossians 1:26-28; Ephesians 1:17-18; etc.

61. This can be seen, for example, when one reads the *Migration*. Cf. Augustine, *C. Faust.*, Bk. 12, c. 39: "[Philo] tried to make sense of some things, not with a view to understanding Christ, in whom he did not believe, but so that it might be made more readily apparent what a great difference there is between referring all things to Christ, on whose account they were thus spoken, and going beyond him by pursuing certain conjectures and resorting to every possible stratagem available to a keen mind. Which goes to show how valid the saying of the Apostle is: when you go to the Lord, the veil will be torn away" (PL 42: 274).

62. "sensus Christi"

63. Cf. HE, 150-66. A judgment that has been received uncritically still prevails oftentimes. Thus F. Lot, *La fin du monde antique* (1927), 433: "Origen applied the system to the Christian books, susceptible as they are to the three senses: literal, moral, and mystical." In *The Pattern of Christian Truth* (1954, p. 289) H. E. W. Turner recalls the

passages where Origen relates the threefold sense and the threefold component parts of man, and concludes: "Here the influence of Philo may reasonably be suspected"; but this threefold sense is not to be found in Philo, and as for the threefold component parts, they are not specifically Philonian. There is a better critical judgment in J. Daniélou's *Sacram. futuri*, 200.

Notes to Chapter Three
§5. Origen's Descendants

1. "vir liberaliter eruditissimus," Augustine, *C. Faust.*, Bk. 12, c. 39 (PL 42: 274).

2. C. Spicq, "Le philonisme de l'Ep. aux Hébr.," *RB* 56 (1949); *L'Ep. aux Hébreux*, 1 (1952), ch. 3 (39-91). Cf. S. W. Baron, *H. d'Israël*, 2 (French translation, 1057), 705; J. Daniélou, *Philon d'Alex.*, 210-3. Against dependence: Hanson, *Allegory and Event*, 83, 94.

3. "Istas obsetrices dixerunt ante nos quidam rationabilis eruditionis formam tenere. . . . Mihi tamen . . . videntur obsetrices istae duae utriusque Testamenti figuram servare." *In Ex.*, h. 2, n. 2 (PG 12: 306 BC).

4. Wisdom 18:24. Philo, *De vita Moysi*, Bk. 3, 8-12. But conversely, in *Q. Ex.*, 2, 109-14, the zodiac becomes the symbol of the 12 Patriarchs, who will, in a Christian milieu, become the 12 Apostles. Cf. J. Daniélou, "Les douze Apôtres et le Zodiaque," *Vig. christ.*, 13, 14-21. As early as Exodus 24:4; 39:14.

5. André Pelletier, "La tradit. synoptique du Voile 'déchiré,' " *RSR* 46 (1958), 161-80.

6. Hugh, *De sacram.*, P. 4, c. 3 (PL 176: 434 C); Innocent III, *De sacr. alt.*, Bk. 1, c. 1 (217: 782 CD); St. Thomas 1a 2ae, q. 102, a. 5, ad 10m; Sixtus of Siena, *Biblia sancta* (2d ed., 1576), 155.

7. Congar, *Le myst. du temple* (1958), 119-36. Cf. J. Benzinger, *Hebraïsche Archäologie* (3d ed., 1927), 163-4, 317-8; Parrot, *Le Temple de Jérus.*, 38-9.

8. *In Ex.*, h. 9, n. 4 (PL 12: 366 A).

9. "opinionem longe aliam," *In Ex.*, h. 9 (12, 361-9); *In Lev.*, h. 6 (466-75). Cf. Rabanus, *De univ.*, Bk. 1, c. 14 (PL 111: 568-9); *Sp. Eccl.* c. 6 (177: 352). This is what Clement had done for the Tabernacle and the High Priest: *Str.* 5, c. 6 (PG 9: 56-68).

10. "expositionem hebraicam," *Ep.* 64, c. 19; cf. c. 9-18 (126-34). J. Labourt, 3, 135, translates this phrase as "a literal explication in the Hebraic manner"; "literal" is excessive, although the cosmic significance is probably original. Cf. Ricciotti, *H. d' Israël*, French trans., 1, 380-1.

11. C. 18 (3, 133).

12. According to the *Libellus de cerimoniis aulae imperatoris*, written in Rome ca. 1030-50, the emperor dons a "belt, that is to say, an imperial band," furnished with 72 small bells, "and on either end of the belt there is a golden disk, embellished with precious stones and pearls, while on the circumference of the disk the following words are to be found: 'Rome, the capital of the world, guides the reins of the zodiac' ": P. E. Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio* (1929), 2, 94-6. The treasure trove of the cathedral at Bamberg holds the mantle of Henri II, with representations of the zodiac, the constellations, the sun, and the moon: Robert Folz, *L'idée d'empire en Occident du V^e^ au XIV^e^ siècle* (1953), 79-81; Eisler, *Weltenmantel und Himmelszelt* (1910).

13. *In Jo.*, Bk. 13 (PL 169: 763-5).

14. "Proinde mysticas jam singulorum rationes subnectimus, sicut a patribus editae sunt, primum secundum Hebraeos, deinde secundum ecclesiasticos." *In Ex.*, Bk. 4, c. 21 (167: 720 D). In Isidore's *L. de variis*, q. c. 8, n. 18-9, there is a more cosmic sketch: "In many ways, to be sure, Sacred Scripture portrays Holy Church in general through clothing etc." (27).

15. *S.* 10: "The water jugs take double or triple measures. The pagans derive a physical and ethical sense from their sacred works, while we discern an allegorical understanding and sometimes an anagogical one over and above the historical and moral one" (PL 194: 1725 D). Here Isaac make the "physical" sense of the pagans correspond more or less to the historical sense of the Bible. See above, 3.4, n. 54.

16. *In Jos.*, h. 7, n. 1-2 (328-30). Cf. h. 4, n. 1 (308-9).

17. French trans. by A. Méhat, SC, 29, 519-20.

18. Dom E. Pichery, SC, 42, 29.

19. "Giovanni Cassiano ed Evagrio Pontico, dottrina sulla carità e contemplazione," *Studia Anselmiana* 5 (1936), particularly pp. 87-149, entitled "Cassiano ed Origene." Dom Capelle, however, thinks (*RHE* 35 [1939], 554-5) that the author has proven a close doctrinal correspondence rather than a literary dependence.

20. M. Cappuyns, *DHGE*, 11, 1334-6. Courcelle, 214.

21. Cf. A. Vaccari, *Scritti . . .*, vol. 2 (1958), 320-3.

22. Origen, *In Lev.*, h. 8, n. 4 (I underline the words that are "Gregorian"): "Verum haec *breviter transcurrere* cogimur, nec singula quae scripta sunt *discutere*, quoniam quidem *festinamus* aliquid etiam de legibus leprae quae recitatae sunt, *pertractare*." [= "But we are compelled to *run through* these matters *briefly* and not to *discuss* each of the things that have been written individually, since we *are in a hurry* to do some *investigating* of the leprosy laws that have been read out"] (400).

23. Origen, *In Jos.*, h. 16, n. 4: "What are we to understand by those evil huntsmen whom the Lord drives out except that they represent the opposite virtues?" (398); H. 18, n. 1: "Whom do we consider to be the princes of our tribes . . . if not the holy apostles?" (406); *In Jud.*, h. 1, n. 2: "Who are the other . . . elders, if not the apostles?" (468); H. 4, n. 1: "What else but the dictates of that philosophy which claims pleasure as the highest good can be seen or understood to be the prince or leader of this lax and dissolute people?" (488); etc.

24. F. Prat, *Origène*, 178.

25. Léon Puech, *L'Ecriture dans S. Irénée*, a thesis for the Faculty of Theology of Toulouse (1936), 33. Hagenbach *(op. cit.)*, who believes that the fourfold sense was already systematized by Clement, notes that the "typical and allegorical" interpretation was in use from the time of the apostolic Fathers. He adds that: "The earlier Fathers indulged unconsciously in his mode of interpretation" (124-5). The adverb here appears to be somewhat too restrictive.

26. *H. crit. du Vieux T.*, vol. 3, c. 10 (new ed. [1685], 403). Cf. Harnack, *Dogmeng.* 1, 647; Alex. Souter, *The Earliest Latin Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul* (1927), 1: ". . . The figure of Origen dominates subsequent efforts for centuries, to a degree which may perhaps be imagined, but can never be adequately estimated"; J. Ranolder, *Hermen. bibl.* (1859), 18: "Innumerable interpreters in many ages have followed his lead in the task of interpreting."

27. "peritissimum divinae legis," Sedulius, *Ep. ad Maced.* (c. 430; J. Huemer, 172).

28. G. Bardy, *La q. des langues dans l'Egl. anc.* (1948), 247.

29. Cf. Jerome, preface to the translation of Didymus (PL 23: 102 A).

30. Bardy, *op. cit.*, 248-50; 252-5; J. de Ghellinck, *Patr. et m. âge*, 2, 197.

31. On Hilary: *De viris inl.*, c. 100 (PL 23: 699-701); *In Mich.*, Bk. 2, preface (25: 1190); *Apol.*, Bk. 1, c. 2; Bk. 3, c. 14 (23: 399 B, 467 C). In 392 he said that Hilary had imitated Origen in his commentary on the psalms. In 400 he presented this commentary as a translation of Origen and repeated that Hilary had copied Origen "with a vehement insistence that we are inclined to find suspicious" (Bardy, 248). On Ambrose: *In Luc.*, preface (2); *Lib. Didymi de Sp.* 1, n. 1 (PL 23: 104). On the two of them: *Ep.* 84, c. 7 (4, 134); *Ep.* 112, c. 20 (6, 40). Likewise for Victorinus: *Ep.* 84, c. 7; *Apol. adv. libros Ruf.*, Bk. 1, c. 2 (PL 23: 399 B; it is indeed a question of Victorinus of Pettau [Petovia], the name of Marius Victorinus: P. Henry, *Plotin et l'Occident*, 46, according to Benz).

32. Thus we have *In Luc.*, Bk. 3, n. 35: "history, morals, mystery" (Tissot, SC, 45, 139); cf. Bk. 7, c. 191-4 (SC, 52, 80-2; a commentary on 1 Thess. 5:23); *De Is. et an.*, c. 24, n. 14 (PL 14: 508 C; cf. 664-5); etc.

33. Thus in the explication of a part of the Song of Songs, *De Is et an.* (PL 14: 501-34); cf. *Ep.* 33, n. 2 (16: 1072 A). The insertion of a passage from Origen's *Dialektos* in translation has recently been identified in Ambrose.

34. Example of the first order: n. 24 and above, Chapter 3.3, n. 36, 37. Example of the second order: *In Job*, c. 38 (PL 26: 749-51), etc. The anthropological and Scriptural trichotomy is explained at length, *Ep.* 120, c. 12: "the celebrated question" (6, 159-63). M. J. Pézard attributes the invention of it to Jerome, who would have been "influenced" only "by a sublime model, the three Persons of the Trinity"! *Dante sous la pluie de feu*, 379.

35. F. Cavallera, *Jérome* (S), DBS (1948), 895: "For years Origen was his delight, and even when had taken sides against him so vociferously, he continued to read and use him, even in his last commentary, where, all the same, he did not forbear to cast some cruel and bitter insults his way." On the dependence of Jerome's commentaries on the Letters of Saint Paul in relationship to Origen: Al. Souter, *op. cit.*, 110-25. Cf. A. Renna, *Principi e carattere dell. esegesi di S. Girolamo* (1950).

36. The commentary on Jeremiah is "purely literal," as Smalley believes, *Study*, 8; J. Steinmann, *S. Jérôme* (1957), 349, recognizes that: "Sometimes Jerome could not help falling into the trap of allegorical exegesis"; likewise regarding the commentary on Ezekiel: "he could not detach himself completely from allegorism" (338). The truth is that he does not seek it out in any way; cf. his own declarations, *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, c. 1 (PL 25: 26 D); Bk. 14 (448 D, 475 C, 480 D, 482 C), etc.; particularly Bk. 5, c. 16: "And we are bidden to understand the eloquence of truth, that is, Sacred Scripture, in a threefold way: firstly, according to the letter, secondly, in an intermediate tropological way, and thirdly, in a more sublime way, learning all its mystical aspects," with texts from Saint Paul for each of the three senses (147-8).

37. Origen is the Greek writer whom Augustine seems to know the best. The dispute surrounding Origen, which had found a venue at that point in the West, made him a topical figure.

38. In 397 (*Ep.* 40, c. 6, n. 9; PL 33: 157-8), Augustine wrote to Jerome in terms that can be construed as meaning that he had a poor understanding of Origen. But the translation of the *Periarchôn* by Rufinus appeared only the following year. Therefore, Augustine's letter is not "quite a bit later" than this translation, as I. Chevalier writes in *S. Aug. et la pensée grecque, les relations trinitaires* (1940), 103. In another letter to Jerome

Augustine "admits to not having read the commentaries that Jerome had pointed out to him" (*ibid.*, 104). But it is a question solely of the commentary on the Letter to the Galatians and Book 10 of the *Stromata* (Jerome, in Augustine, *Ep.* 75, c. 3, n. 4); PL 33: 252-3). Courcelle (194) seems also to generalize somewhat too freely about the meaning of this admission on Augustine's part.

39. Gennadius, *De script. eccl.* 36 (PL 58: 1078 C).

40. B. Altaner, "Die Benützung von original grieschischen Vätertexten durch Augustinus," *Zeitschr. Religions- u. Geistesgesch.*, 1 (1948), 71-9; "Augustinus u. Origenes, eine quellencritische Unters.," *Hist. Jahrb.* 70 (1951), 15-41. Cf. Ernst Benz, *Marius Victorinus* (1932), app. 1, 222-9: "Viktorin u. Or."; H. I. Marrou, *S. Augustin et la fin de la culture ant.*, 36-7, 420; J. de Ghellinck, *Patr. et m. âge*, 2, 276; Courcelle, 185-7.

41. Thus "curiositas," the illusion of "those who seem to be on the inside," the paschal lamb, the understanding of the faith, the submission of the world to the man who is submissive to God, etc. Augustine also speaks, in the wake of Origen (*In Lev.*, h. 12, n. 5, 463), of "chastity" or "virginity of mind," which is "simplicity of faith"; this is a theme which will be carried forward: Quodvultdeus, *De prom.*, P. 1, c. 12, n. 19 (PL 51: 744 AB); Gerhoh, *L. de laude fidei* (*Op. in.*, 1, 236); Galland de Rigny, *Libellus Prov.*, 61 (J. Châtillon, 61); etc. Cf. the exegesis of 1 Corinthians 2:2 in *In ps. 130*, 4-10 (250: 40, 1906).

42. Do we not already hear the accents of Augustine on Saint John in *In Num.*, h. 20, n. 3: "And it does not suffice that He be with us, but in some way He gives us strength, so as to draw us to salvation. . . . He himself not only calls us to salvation, but draws us as well. For the Lord speaks thus in the gospel: No one can come to me unless it is granted him by the Father. . . . Thus we are not only invited by God, but also drawn and compelled to salvation . . ." (195). Or should we suppose that it is the translator who took his inspiration from Augustine?

43. Some, for example, have set up an opposition between Augustine's positing of a simple "difference in the assimilation of the same doctrine" and Origen's distinction between "several degrees of doctrine" (cf. Dom Capelle, *RTAM* 11 [1930], 410-19, following Lebreton). Now Augustine's expressions, as cited above, correspond exactly to those of Origen. Thus in "pro suo modo quique capiebant" [= "each of them understood things in his own way"] we recognize ὡς ἕκαστος χωρεῖ [= *hōs hekastos chōrei* = "in accordance with the capacity of each"]: M. Harl, *op. cit.*, 264.

44. Thus Augustine, *Q. ev.*, Bk. 2, q. 19 (PL 35: 1240-1), and Origen, *In Luc.*, h. 34 (201-5). Cf. M. Rauer, *Form und Ueberlieferung der Lukas-homelien des Origenes* (TU 47 [1932]), 46-9.

45. *Nouv. Bibliothèques des auteurs ecclés.*, new ed., 1 (1731), 142.

46. *Confessions*, Bk. 3, c. 5-6 (I, 51-2).

47. "ecclesiastica interpretatio"

48. "vilitas verborum"

49. Jerome, *Ep.* 48, c. 4; 53, c. 10 (2, 118; 3, 23).

50. Lactantius, *Div. inst.*, Bk. 6, c. 21 (Brandt, 562). Cf. Arnobius, *Adv. nat.*, Bk. 1, c. 59 (5, 797-8).

51. J. Steinmann, *S. Jérome*, 54.

52. *C. Cels.*, Bk. 6, c. 77 (2, 146-9); cf. Bk. 7, c. 50-61 (209-10); Bk. 3, c. 39 (1, 235); *In Ex.*, h. 1, n. 1 (145). Cf. *In Num.* h. 9, n. 6 (62).

53. *C. Cels.*, Bk. 7, c. 59 (2, 208).

54. *In Jo.*, Bk. 19, 9 (308); cf. Bk. 4, 1-2 (98-9).

55. Furthermore, it would constitute a double fault of method to seek to understand Origen by following Augustine.

56. "Multa hic dicere non oportuit, cum Origenes, singula discutiens, quae recta fide sensit Domino consignaverit Christo," P. 2, c. 6, n. 11 (PL 51: 775 B).

57. *In Os.*, Bk. 1 (PL 21: 963-6).

58. In 392, in *De vir. inl.*, c. 105, Jerome wrote of him that: "he is said to be alive today" (PL 23: 703 A); in 400, Gregory was not at the Council of Toledo. On Gregory of Elvira see: R. Thouvenot's *Essai sur la province rom. de Bétique* (1940), 341-7.

59. It can be asked if he would have had time to know and use the translations of Rufinus, which he appears to have copied here and there (notably tr. 3 = *In Gen.*, h. 7-8). Dom Morin concluded that the author was an anonymous figure of the fifth century (*RB* 19 [1902], 244-5). On this problem see: A. Wilmart, *BLE* (1906), 264-6; Paul Lejay, "L'héritage de Gr. d'Elv.," *RB* 25 (1908), 445: "The writer of the treatise makes use, no doubt, of Origen and Hippolytus. Nobody will suppose that he had read them in the original. . . . From this everything comes down to the question of the originality of Rufinus's translations." Labriolle (pp. 172-4) has doubts. H. Rahner (*Biblica* 22 [1941], 381) proposed Novatian as the author. A. Garcia Conde (*Cuadernos de Est. gallegos* 4 [1949], 27-56) proposes Avitus, a Galician, who brought Origen's books from the East to Spain, and who would have written the *Tractatus* around 400-405 with another man named Avitus, who had returned from Rome (cf. *BTAM*, 6, 594).

60. *Tractatus Origenis*

61. At times his interpretations reflect Origen and at other times Hippolytus: Wilmart, *loc. cit.*, 259-60, note. For an examination of Gregory's writings: A. C. Vega, "Una gran figura literaria española del s. IV, Gregorio de Elvira" (*Ciudad de Dios* 156 [1944], 205-58).

62. *De ben. Patr.* (PL 21: 301-10, 313-26), despite the phrase at 310 B. Cf. PG 12: 253 C. The work was written at the request of Paulinus of Nola.

63. *De scr. eccl.*, c. 17: "He discussed Jacob's blessing . . . in terms of a threefold sense, that is to say, historical, moral, and mystical" (PL 58: 1070 B).

64. St. Patrick would have made a long stay at Lerins (?). In 433, the Abbot of Lerins was Faustus, a Breton, who was to become the bishop of Riez, in which position he kept up contact with the Bretons.

65. PL 23: 1173; 25, 586 A; 226, 219 A.

66. "in adulescentia," *Adv. libros Ruf.*, Bk. 2, c. 23 (PL 23: 447 A). At that point he was more than 33 years old. Cf. *Ep.* 84, c. 6-7 (4, 131-3).

67. Sebanc trans. from the French of Fr. Fournier.

68. Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca*, c. 46, n. 5 (French trans. by A. Lucot, p. 311). The bishop of Helenopolis knew Rufinus well, for he had met him at Melania's villa on the Appian Way, which was also frequented by Cassian and Paulinus of Nola.

69. At one point P. de Labriolle even spoke of "transposition in bad faith" regarding the translation of the *Periarchôn*: *BALC*, 4 [1914], 289.

70. *De usu Patrum* (Latin translation, Geneva, 2d ed. [1656]), 65-6: "Rufinus . . . took so much license with the writings of Origen, Eusebius, and others, which he translated from Greek to Latin, that there is not a page of his translations in which he did not excise, add, or interpolate something"; cf. pp. 17, 54, 152.

71. Bardy, *Recherches* (1923); *La question des langues* (1948). M. Villain, "Rufin

d'Aquilée . . ." (*NRT* [1937]); *RSR* [1937, 1946]). Fr. X. Murphy, *Rufin of Aquilea* (1945). M. M. Wagner, *Rufinus the Translator;* B. Botte, *RTAM,* 25, 156; H. Cornélis, *RSPT* (1959), 66, 247.

72. Bardy, *Rech.,* 105: "When he translates literally, he says so. When he is content to make a broad adaptation, he says so too. . . ." Regarding the commentary on the Letter to the Romans "he himself informs us that the Greek manuscripts which he has in hand are altered and incomplete and that he has expanded, abridged, and reworked his text": J. Schérer, 8; cf. 85ff. Cf. H. Chadwick, *JTS* (1959), 10-42. See below, Chapter 4.1.

73. Palladius, n. 6: "There was nobody who was more educated and more modest than he." Paulinus of Nola to Sulpicius Severus, c. 402-4: "For this reason, Rufinus the priest, a truly holy and piously learned man, is bound to me with an intimate affection" (*Ep.* 28, n. 5; 145).

74. Ebert did not cite the translations of Origen as being numbered among only two writings of Rufinus which had been retained by reason of "their general importance with respect to history and literature" (1, 345). F. X. Murphy, however, thinks that by reason of his translations Rufinus is one of the founders of the Middle Ages. In *RMAL* 7 (1951), 195-200 F. Chatillon looks at Rufinus's Latin adaptation of the discourses of Gregory Nazianzen and deplores the lack of attention that these intermediary works have suffered. These works, he claims, "should be counted worthy of inclusion among the research and source documents of the historian, inasmuch as long ago they were of account in the civilizations and cultures which they helped to forge."

75. "Totus quippe mundus tantis affligitur cladibus!" *Ep.* 111, n. 1 (PL 33: 422). Cf. Rufinus, preface to the translation of Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History,* to Chromatius (PL 21: 462-4). On these events see: Robert Latouche, *Les grandes invasions* (1946), P. 1, c. 4.

76. "Fugitur per marina discrimina, et ne ipsa quidem absque metu habentur exsilia."

77. J. Brochet, *S. Jérôme et ses ennemis* (1906), 379.

78. *Ep.* 126, c. 2 (PL 22: 1086). Rome's misfortunes did not prompt Jerome to forget his quarrel. He alludes, in triumphant tones, to the death of the "scorpion," "who had been crushed in the land of Sicily."

79. *In Ez.,* Bk. 1 (PL 25: 15-7).

80. Prologue to Ursacius (PG 12: 583-6).

81. *Ibid.*: "I strive as well as I can to explain what you have enjoined. For now, of all the things that I have found to be written on the law, only the homilies on Deuteronomy, I think, are lacking. And these, if the Lord grants me the grace and gives me healthy eyes, I wish to add to the remaining body of my work, although my dearest son, Pinianus, . . . enjoins other things as well" (12: 585-6).

82. "It is quite likely," Father de Ghellinck has written (*Patr. et m. âge,* 2, 369), "that the scope and extent of Origen's work were prejudicial to its preservation, quite as much, perhaps, as the suspicion which he fell victim to in the middle of the sixth century." There would have been more than merely "suspicion"! On Justinian's balance sheet, even the construction of Hagia Sophia does not make up for the destruction of Origen's work.

83. Alexandre de Saint-Phalle, *De S. Paul à Mahomet* (1952), 158.

84. This influence was recognized long ago. Thus we have J. A. Ernesti (1756), St.

Wiest (1794), etc., as well as Sanday. But it was an influence that for a long while was little adverted to. Cf. J. de Ghellinck, *Misc. Fr. Ehrlé*, 5 (1923), 247: "The Greek exegetical tradition, apart from a few works of Chrysostom, had only small purchase in the West. . . . Greek patristics, outside of Pseudo-Dionysius and John Damascene . . . did not have a profound influence, directly, on the formation of our Fathers." For some years now, a more accurate appreciation has been seeing the light of day. Fr. Chatillon had a good appreciation of the "prodigious influence of Origen's thought, transmitted as it was in different directions all at once: *RMAL* 10 (1904), 175. For the writings of Dom Jean Leclercq, see below, Chapter 4.

85. M. D. Chenu, *La théol. au XIIe siècle*, 174, 178, 282-3.

Notes to Chapter Four
§1. The Reading of Origen in the Middle Ages

1. Cf. Orosius to Augustine (PL 42: 667).

2. "Noster Origenes, catholicus tractator, contra haereses dimicans et vincens," Bk. 1, 43 (PL 53: 599-600). The author could be Arnobius the younger (Morin, *Etudes* . . . , 1, 309-82; Labriolle has doubts, in 2, 660).

3. "peritissimus divinae legis Origenes," to Macedonius (G. Huemer, 72).

4. *Ep.*, Bk. 9, *Ep.* 2: "Because Jerome the translator, Augustine the dialectician, and Origen the allegorist are concerned that you should have sheaves that are full of the spiritual meanings of saving doctrine, I, for my part, shall not be the one who causes your fasting tongue to rustle like a dry stalk" (Luetjohann, MGH [1887], 150). On Sidonius: N. K. Chadwick, *Poetry and Letters in Early Christian Gaul*, 296-327.

5. "scaevus cavendusque tractator," Bk. 2, *Ep.* 9: "Adamantius Origenes, who was translated by Turannius Rufinus, was diligently examined by readers of our faith. Being like each one of them at heart, he discussed different subjects thoughtfully. Why was he condemned by some of our chief priests, as if he were a perverse and fearful writer of treatises, even though he has been so accurately translated in word and sentence that, in terms of a well-turned, idiomatic use of the Latin tongue, we may say that Apuleius did not do as good a job on Plato's *Phaedo*, nor Cicero on the *Ctesiphon* of Demosthenes?" (31)

6. Because Sidonius refers to Rufinus's translation, André Loyen construes it as an "admission" (*Sidoine Apollinaire* . . . [1943], 27 and 36-7). Furthermore, he concludes from this text that Sidonius "knew that Origen's orthodoxy was doubtful," which is to force or even betray the meaning of this passage. He appears to place the "transposition" by Rufinus in opposition to the "translations" by Cicero and Apuleius, whereas it is, in fact, the converse case that he is making. It is quite possible, on the other hand, that reading Origen, "so far from endowing the mind with a taste for meditation," actually contributed in a case like that of Sidonius to "heightening his subtlety" and favored, in fact, his "stylistic affectations." But to generalize from an observation of this kind to the point where it is seen as embodying the essence of the influence exercised by Origen's exegesis seems to me to go beyond all due measure. H. I. Marrou has some good observations in *RMAL*, 1 (1945), 203-4.

7. This, at least, is the opinion of Courcelle, 237. Is it quite certain?

8. It is the only Greek source that is pointed out in those writings of Faustus that have been preserved: Courcelle, 220-1, who follows C. Weyman, *Philologus* 54 (1895), 185.

9. References in 250, 104 (Lambot), 1048: "from his homilies on the Old Testament Caesarius borrowed many things for his own catecheses."

10. There were, however, certain expressions which had come from Origen-Rufinus that were already commonplaces. Thus we have *In Ez.*, Bk. 2, h. 10, n. 3: "But let no one suppose that I am impetuously changing the words of the Holy Spirit to suit my own understanding" (PL 76: 1059 D); Origen, *In Lev.*, h. 7, n. 4: "Let no one suppose that I do violence to the divine Scriptures" (382). Previously Jerome, *In Eph.*: "Unless . . . we should seem to do violence to Scripture . . ." (PL 26: 520 CD); Augustine, *In ps.* 77, n. 23: "let us not seem to bring violence to bear on divine words" (250, 39: 1084); etc. This question of Gregory's relationship to Origen has not been studied methodically.

Cf. the brief remarks of Michel Frickel, O.S.B., *Deus totus ubique simul; Untersuchungen zur allergenauesten Gottgezeugnuurt im Rahmen der Gatteselehre Gregors des Grossen* (1956), 75 and 122 note. And G. Jouassard, *Mél. Salaville*, 119, n. 2.

11. *Vita*, Bk. 4, c. 69 (PL 75: 221-3). The episode is doubtful; "as is reported by a great many," says John the Deacon.

12. C. 591-5, to Gregory: "Indeed, we have six little books by blessed Hilary, the bishop of Poitiers, which he translated from the Greek of Origen. But he did not set forth everything in the order followed by the book of Holy Job" (MGH, *Greg. Ep.*, 1, 60).

13. Cf. Jerome, *Ep.* 82, n. 7; 84, n. 7 (4, 118, 134); *Apol.*, Bk. 1, c. 2 (PL 23: 399 B). These testimonies are not perfectly clear. See above, Chapter 3.5, n. 31.

14. *Inst.*, c. 6: "I have found the separate homilies by Origen that were published in the Greek tongue on the two books of Esdras. These have been translated through the efforts of this same fellow Bellator, who is a religous man" (PL 70: 1118 D; cf. 1117 B, etc.).

15. *Inst.*, c. 1: "Four sermons on Deuteronomy, in which there are very detailed, subtle explanations" (70: 1112 B).

16. "Enclosure"

17. *L'Eglise et les derniers Romains*, 293-4. Courcelle, 337-8.

18. Cf. Pierre Courcelle, "Le site du monastère de Cassiodore," *Mél. d'archéol. et d'hist.*, Ecole française de Rome, 55 (1938), 259-307. "Nouvelles recherches sur le monastère de C.," *Actes du V^e congrès intern. d'archéol. chrét.* (1957), 511-28.

19. *Inst.*, c. 1: "The same holds true of Origen's exceedingly eloquent homilies on the Octateuch, in three books . . ." (1111 C; 1112 BC). Cassiodorus speaks of the Octateuch, because in this collection he includes the homilies on Deuteronomy, which are now lost, and the explication of the Book of Ruth that was undertaken by Bellator to make up for the ancient, missing commentaries: "I could not in any wise find the ancient commentaries on Ruth. . . ." Cf. A. Van de Vyver, "Les Institutions de Cassiodore et sa fondation à Vivarium," *RB* 53 (1941). The text mistakenly carries 30 homilies on Joshua, instead of 26 (1112 B). The merits of Rufinus as a translator, like those of Jerome, are appreciated by Cassiodorus: c. 17 (1133 CD). Cf. Gennadius, c. 17 (58: 1069-70).

20. Courcelle, 366-7, 373-4, 379.

21. Fragments of the homilies on Leviticus were rediscovered at the beginning of this century at Fleury. One manuscript is from the seventh century (probably the beginning of the century). Two others seem to be somewhat more ancient. P. Courcelle, "Fragments patris. de Fleury-sur-Loire," *Mél. F. Grat*, 2 (1949), 146-54.

22. M. Deanesly, *H. de l'Europe du haut m. âge* (French translation by S. M. Guillemin, 1958), 644.

23. P. de Labriolle, *BALC* (1914), 99-100; G. H. [Hocquart], *RMAL*, 1, 192.

24. The work was comprised of ten books: Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, Bk. 6, c. 32, n. 2 (Bardy, SC, 41, 134); Jerome, *Ep.* 33, n. 4 (2, 41). It is not known whether Rufinus translated them all. What remains for us of his translation is the prologue, Books 1-3, and a part of Book 4. Rufinus seems to paraphrase. Perhaps the fragments of the Catenae are summaries (Völker).

25. Cassiodorus, *Inst.*, c. 8: "Just as Origen used twenty books to explain, in the Greek tongue, what Rufinus abridged into ten books and also translated at length into

Latin" (1120-1). On this work: Jean Scherer, *Le commentaire d'Or. sur Rom. 3:5–5:7* (Le Caire, 1957), c. 5, 86-121: "The 'translation' of Rufinus."

26. P. de Labriolle, *BALC* 4 (1914), 288.

27. E. Dümmler, *Das Formelbuch des Bischofs Salomo III v. Konstanz*, 50-2; J. M. Clark, *The Abbey of St. Gall* (1926), 97 and 109. *De interpr. div. Script.*, c. 2 (PL 131: 996 AB).

28. *Inst.*, c. 5: "Likewise Saint Jerome, that famous multiplier of the Latin language, provided us, as he was wont to do, with his commendable translation of the two homilies of Origen that explicate the Song of Songs" (70: 1117 A); c. 3: "Origen explicated Jeremiah . . . in forty-five homilies in the Greek tongue. Of these I have found fourteen translated, and I have bequeathed them to you" (1114 C).

29. E. Klostermann has edited them in *Or. Werke*, 12, 1, 236-69. He seems to regard them as authentic.

30. Huet looked to the circle of Cassiodorus. E. Kostermann and E. Benz, *Zur Ueberlieferung der Matthäuserklarung des Or.* (TU 47 [1931]) proposed Bellator. Cf. G. Morin, *RB* 37 (1925), 239-62; 54 (1942), 3-11. There is a summary of the question in Albert Siegmund, OSB, *Die Ueberlieferung der Griechischen Christlichen Literatur in der lat. Kirche bis zum wölften Jahr.* (1949), 110-23.

31. Leclercq, *L'amour des lettres*, 93; "Or. au XIIe siècle," *Irenikon* 24 (1951), 425.

32. Ratpert, *De origine et div. casibus mon. S. Galli*, c. 9 (Goldast-Senckenberg, vol. I, 1730, p. 9).

33. Thus Dom U. Berlière, *L'ascèse bénédictine* (1927), 108-10. There is even a blank in H. Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (1927), 79-82 (despite the particular mention of p. 83). In "En marge des catalogues des biblioth. médiévales" (*Misc. Fr. Ehrlé*, 5, 1924, 331-63), de Ghellinck notes some of the volumes of Origen, but does not cite him in the list of frequent authors (334). On p. 333 he writes: "The Christian writers who predate the Council of Nicaea disappear almost completely from the catalogs of our fathers"; cf. 342 and 347 (See above, Chapter 3.5, n. 84.)

34. "Origenes varios praeclaros conserit actus."

35. E. Lesne, *H. de la propriété eccl. en France*, 4 (1928), *passim;* with other examples. Cf. PL 150: 773 B. *Gesta abbatum Fontanell.*, 17 (MGH, *Scr.*, 2, 297).

36. G. Morin, *RB*, 22, 5.

37. *Benedictina* 5 (1951), 10.

38. Letter of King Lothaire to Rabanus: "You have concluded that great book with your tributes to that noblest of leaders, Joshua, who is a prefigurative type of the eternal king, Jesus Christ" (PL 110: 495 A).

39. Cartulaire de N. D. de Chartres (De Lépinois-Merlet, 1862-5), 3, 202; 1, 152.

40. G. Nortier-Marchand, in *Jumièges, congrès scientif. du 13e siècle* (1955), 601.

41. Pio Censi, *Misc. Fr. Ehrlé*, 5, 322-3.

42. Cf. H. Haskins, 83.

43. Leclercq, *Irenikon*, 24, 428; following Wilmart, *L'anc. bibl. de Clairvaux;* Mém. de la Soc. acad. de l'Aube, 53 (1917), 150.

44. J. M. Déchanet, *Guill. de S. Thierry* (1942), n. 3.

45. Leclercq, *L'amour des lettres*, 93.

46. A. Boutemy, *Mél. F. Grat*, 2, 179-222.

47. Manitius, 3, 291.

48. Leclercq, *L'amour des lettres*, 90.

49. *Porl.:* "Not that I should think it possible to speak of the matters which he

bypassed, but rather is it the case that I shall set down in this short, little commentary what he himself discussed in books or homilies or what I think worthy of being read" (PL 26: 823-4). *In ps. 1:* "For while I was choosing from among the samples of Origen in the library at Caesarea, I found only one work" (824 D). For an example of Origen's first schematic arrangement: *In ps. 115* (1173). Cf. Morin, *RB,* 25, 90.

50. Pitra's hypothesis, confirmed by G. Morin, *RB* 25 (1908), 93. Cf. L. Brou, *St. patr.,* 11, 18; Cappuyns, *DHGE,* 11, 1380. On the authentic portions of Jerome incorporated into the work: *An. mar.,* 3, P. 1 and 3, prefaces.

51. *Myst. exp. sacr.,* preface n. 5 (PL 83: 209 A).

52. *Progn.,* Bk. 2, c. 26-8 (PL 96: 487-91). On this work: J. N. Hillgarth, *Analecta sacra Tarrac.* 30 (1957), 5-61.

53. M. Cappuyns, *Jean Scot Erigène* (1923), 28.

54. Wilmart, *Anal. reginensa,* 58. They would only be from the ninth century: *idem, RB,* 45, 350-1.

55. *Ep.* 3 (PL 94: 671 C, 675 AB). The influence, however, of Origen on Bede is chiefly indirect, notably by way of Jerome and Gregory.

56. Notably 60, 15: "It is better for the person who is seeking the life of perfection to die on the journey than not to set out on the quest for perfection" (Rochais, 193). This is not the sign of a man who, it has been written, perceived "Christianity more as a code of behavior than as a revelation of interior life."

57. "Origenus dixit"

58. "Contribution à l'hist. des florilèges exég. du haut m. âge latin," *RB* 63 (1953), 282, 288. It is from Defensor that Alcuin borrows two citations in his *Liber de virtutibus et vitiis:* Rochais, *R. Mab.,* 41 (1951), 77-86.

59. *Lib. adv. Graecos,* c. 157-61 (PL 121: 734-7).

60. *De inst. laic.,* Bk. 1, c. 5 (PL 106: 130-1); *De inst. regia,* c. 12-14 (J. Réviron, 173-4, 178, 183); *De cultu imag.,* Bk. 2 (106: 343 B).

61. Jean Jolivet, *Godescalc d'Orbais et la Trinité* (1958), 19.

62. *Ep.* 2 (in 815, to the Abbot Justus, preface to the *Exp. in Matt.*): he has made extracts "from the treatises of the learned doctors and our ancestors; who, in their devotion to this labor, have gone before us both in terms of time and in terms of their knowledge, that is to say, Origen's etc." (MGH, *Ep.* 4, 594). (*In Rom.,* preface): chiefly he made use of Augustine; "We have added some things from the same passage in Origen's exposition. . . . I remind you, too, my dear man, for your information, that Origen wrote three volumes on this Letter, and I have followed him in part" (599, 600).

63. He cites Origen among those who have commented on Matthew before him (MGH, *Ep.* 5, 388). *Ep.* 10: "another learned doctor" (396). *Ep.* 23 (430). *Ep.* 44 to Hincmar, a kind of anthology, on the errors of Godescalc, cites Origen's *in Rom.* three times (493-4). These citations had been surveyed by J.B. Hablitzel, "Hrabanus Maurus . . . (*Bibl. Studien,* 11, 3, Freiburg [1906]), 74-82. Laistner, however, does not mention Origen among Rabanus's sources. In *A Monument to St. Jerome* (1952), he says that the collections of Claudius and Rabanus are comprised, in essence, "of quotations from the Four Doctors, and occasionally one or two other Patristic sources" (p. 241).

64. *Ep.* 28: "For it is said that Origen explicated the prophet in question by means of 45 homilies in Greek. I have found only 14 of these translated, and they have not been an insignificant aid to me in this work. And the explications of the rest of the prophets, which the aforesaid interpreter of the divine law produced, made for a lucid

explanation of the meaning of Jeremiah in many places" (443). The fourteen homilies that were found and transmitted by Cassiodorus are recognizable here (see above).

65. MGH, *Conc.*, 2, 490-1, 495, 541, 545, 621, 662-5; *ibid.*, 761.

66. J. Madoz, *Epistolario* . . . , 96, 98, 103, 105, 106, 113.

67. *In Rom., passim* (PL 134).

68. Baehrens noted this: Laistner (*Harvard Theological Review* [1953]) provided a more precise proof of this by referring to the following remarks by Angelome: "On this issue, read Origen in his dispute with Apelles" (PL 115: 158 A). For neither Rabanus nor the others who cite Origen on the ark had mentioned Apelles. Angelome cites *In Gen.*, homilies 2, 5, 12, and 14 (158 A, 188 BD, 189 A, 190-1, 210-1 . . .).

69. *Ep. de quat. temp.* (PL 160: 823 C).

70. *Ad Gebehardum*, c. 40, 45, 55 (*L. de lite*, 1, 381, 390, 408).

71. On the Church, which is "sublimely one, uniquely unique" (*L. de lite*, 3, 529). The editor was not able to identify the citation. In any case, it expresses Origen's idea in the commentary on the Song of Songs quite well.

72. Prologue to Bk. 2 of the commentary on the Song of Songs (*Revue Bénédictine*, 62, 282; Leclercq, *St. ans.*, 31, 183).

73. Prologue on the Letters of Saint Paul (Engelberg ms.): Leclercq, *Misc. Lombardiana*, 110-2. "About ten times": J. de Ghellinck, *Mouvement*, 243.

74. A. Landgraf, 4 vols. (1037-45).

75. *Ad Innoc. pap.; Lib. de simoniacis* (*L. de lite*, 3, 227, 266).

76. *Sup. Eccl.* (Calandra, 67).

77. *Lib. except.* (J. Châtillon, 225, 239, 268, 271-2).

78. PL 186: 28 C, 45 B. Cf. Klostermann, *Nachlese* . . . (TU 47 [1932], 9-11).

79. He cites *De sacramentis* (R. M. Martin [1937], 74, 101, 103), the homilies on Leviticus, and the commentary on Matthew.

80. C. 1170-90; cites the *In Matt.* and the *De princ.* (H. Betti [1955], 100, 119).

81. Cites the homilies *In Lev.* and *In Num.* (R. M. Martin, 33-4, 78, 89-90).

82. Cites *In Lev.* (Martin).

83. *Symb. electorum, Ep.* 24 (*Opera*, J. S. Brewer, 1, 1861, 275, 284-5, 287-8); *Gemma eccl.* (vol. 2, 36-7, 149, 170, 175, 200); *Spec. eccl.* (vol. 3, 333, 334): *In Ex., In Lev., In Num., In Rom.*

84. S. Harrison Thomson, "Grosseteste's Concordantial Signs," *Med. et Humanistica* 9 (1955), 49-50.

85. C. 26, long passage from the commentary on Matthew (PL 178: 765 AC).

86. Prologue (178: 1322-3).

87. Déchanet, *Guill. de S. Th.* (1942), app. 2: list of William's sources (200-9); 45-8, 114-7, 186.

88. L. Bouyer, *La spirit. de Cîteaux*, 109.

89. MGH, *Ep.* 3, 396-7.

90. H. Ostlender, *Flor. patr.*, 19 (1929), 32: Origen, *In Lev.*, h. 7, n. 5.

91. J. Madoz, *Epistolario* . . . , 96, 103, 116.

92. Bk. 2 (Talbot, 56-61). These are Origen's homilies as translated by Rufinus: Wilmart, *RB* 50 (1938), 65. Pseudo-Jerome's *Ep.* 8 (PL 30: 116-22) is homily 8 of Origen's *In Jer.* (PG 13: 335-47), homily 5 in Jerome's translation (PL 25: 625-32).

93. *In Cant.*, h. 2, n. 8 (SC, 37, 92-4); *Glossa* (PL 113: 1137 BC); Peter Lombard, *Sent.*, Bk. 3, d. 29, c. 2 (Q., 1916, 683).

94. This is the case when Rabanus cites a homily from the collection of Paul the Deacon (PL 107: 749 AB). *Hom. 17 in Gen.* is taken from Rufinus's *De ben. Patriarch.*, with some passages from Origen mixed in: J. Chatillon, *Mél. Robert*, p. 541. Otherwise it is indeed Origen's. A manuscript of the twelfth century cites a *Tractatus Origenis super Johannem*. This is John Scotus's homily on St. John (Cappuyns, 231-2). A homily on Mary Magdalen, often attributed to Origen, belongs to Odo of Morimond: H. Barré, *COCR*, 1959, 123.

95. Pitra, 1, 266ff.

96. *Ibid.*, 278ff.

97. Poole (*Med. Thought*, 26-7) does not point to Origen as the source of Claudius's compilation. In the whole work, Claudius does not cite him once.

98. Cf. Klost. and Benz, *op. cit.* (TU [1931]), 7-9.

99. *Adv. Elip.*, Bk. 1, c. 99-110 (PL 96: 956-62).

100. *In Rom.*, c. 16 (PL 103: 124 D) = Origen, *In Rom.*, Bk. 10, n. 31 (PG 14: 1282 C). Cf. *In Rom.*, c. 13: "We have frequently said . . ." (103, 118 C) = Origen, Bk. 9, n. 34 (PG 14: 1234 B).

101. PL 17: 9-42.

102. PL 145: 1052-64. Cf. Jerome, *Ep.* 78 (4, 52-93).

103. PL 145: 389 (waters of Marah). Cf. also *Ep.*, Bk. 2, *Ep.* 13 (144: 280); op. 32, c. 2 (145: 546-7); or *s.* 6 (144: 540 B) = *In Ex.*, h. 7, n. 8 (214-7).

104. Leclercq, *R. Mab.*, 36 (1946), 9.

105. God., *Microcosmus*. Cf. Delhaye, *ET*, c. 8, 156-77: microcosm as an exegetical theme.

106. The text that is reproduced in Migne lacks the burden of excess citations attributable to later centuries. But the whole thing was done without precise norms. Cf. J. Chatillon, *Mél. Robert*, 545, n. 3. On the origins of the *Glossa:* B. Smalley, *RTAM* 7 and 8 (1935-6); *Cambridge Historical Journal* 6 (1938), 103-13.

107. PL 113: 183-296.

108. *S. 34 de div.* (PL 183: 630-4). For *In Cant., s.* 54, n. 3, see Chapter 4.4 below.

109. Thus n. 13 (PL 184: 418 C); n. 34 (434 B). Cf. Leclercq, *Etudes*, 119.

110. J. Daniélou, in *S. Bernard th.*, 48-51. Compare Origen's *In Jos.*, h. 8, n. 1; *De princ.*, Bk. 2, c. 6; Bk. 4, c. 3, n. 13; *In Cant.*, Bk. 3 (PG 13: 153-4) with Bernard's *In adv., s.* 2, n. 10; *In asc., s.* 5, n. 11; *In Cant., s.* 20, n. 1 and 6; *s.* 31, n. 8-9; *s.* 45, n. 5; *s.* 48, n. 6-7; *s.* 72, n. 5; *s.* 75, n. 2. Cf. Ambrose, *In Luc.*, Bk. 7, n. 38-9 (Tissot, SC, 52, 21-2); n. 214 (89).

111. N. 14 (PL 183: 68-9; cf. 95, 1164-5); Origen, Vol. 12, 241-2. Rabanus (PL 107: 749 AB). We owe this information to Dom Edmond Boissard (Solesmes). Bernard "declares that he is not going to give his own opinion, but that of the Fathers. And the reason that he adduces is that Joseph felt himself to be a sinner who was unworthy of approaching such a great mystery. He compares this fear to that of Saint Peter ("leave me, Lord"), that of the centurion ("I am not worthy"), and that of Elizabeth ("and why is this granted me . . ."). Now this reason, dependent on the same three texts, in the same order, is in the admirable homily" of Pseudo-Origen: h. 1, n. 2 (Kl. 241-2).

112. Leclercq, "S. Bernard et Origène d'après un ms. de Madrid," *RB* 59 (1949), 194-5: "Saint Bernard gladly spoke of Origen. . . . [He] recognized that Origen should be used with caution, but he was not fearful of reading him extensively. When it was his turn to speak — and this happened daily — he would comment on the texts of

Origen. . . . He summarized them or expanded on them as the case required. In brief, he preached 'on the words and sayings of Origen.' These free commentaries of Origen were then no less freely summarized by those who heard them and who were probably unaware of the source from which the speaker took his inspiration. — The *Flores* of Madrid allow us to suppose that, if Bernard preached on Origen, it was not to correct his errors and clarify them for his monks. He does not criticize him, etc." Similarly: "Or. au XIIe siècle," *Irenikon* (1951), 425; "Ecrits monastiques sur la Bible aux XI-XIIe siècles," *Med. St.* 15 (1953), etc. Cf. Bardy, "Or. et S. Bernard," *RMAL* 1 (1945), 420-21; Ph. Delhaye, "Le problème de la conscience morale chez S. Bernard," *Analecta mediaevalla namurcensia* 9 (1957), 57-8, 62-4, 73-5.

113. *De dil. Deo*, c. 1 (PL 182: 974). Cf. Origen, *In Cant.*, Bk. 3 (186: 198); Leclercq, *Etudes* (120, n. 2).

114. Leclercq, "Les écrits de Geoffroy d'Auxerre," *RB* 62 (1952), 281-3. Geoffrey also notices a particular similarity of style between Bernard and Ambrose. It is often very close to that of Origen: "But there were those in his day who said that, more than all the other great doctors, his style was an imitation of that of Ambrose"; Sermon on St. Bernard (Leclerq, *Etudes*, 164).

115. "flores Bernardi"

116. *Etudes*, 49, n. 2.

117. "Flores Origenis"

118. Leclercq, *RB*, 59, 183, 193. It is clear that if Bernard "did not read the Fathers at all" (M. Hélin, *Litt. d'Occident*, 74), he did, in any case, read Origen.

119. *A Cluny, congrès scientifique* (1950), 33. Bernard, *In Cant., s.* 22, n. 2: "You should have your very own wellspring, in which no stranger should have a share" (PL 183: 878 C).

120. Proverbs 5:15. Origen, *In Gen.*, h. 7, n. 5: "You who, like Isaac, are a son of the promise, drink the waters of your wellsprings . . ." (75). Geoffrey of Auxerre refers to homily 6: "The wellspring of the gardens. . . . Drawing on these wells, Origen proceeds to describe many things in his sixth homily on Genesis" (Leclercq, *St. ans.*, 31, 183). Cf. Isidore, *L. de variis quaestionibus*, c. 50, n. 1 (Vega-Anspach, 145).

121. L. Bouyer, *La spir. des Prémontrés aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles* (1947), 99, 168.

122. See above, Chapter 1.3. For Origen Jesus is to be found "in the abode of the Father," which is to say that Scripture, which speaks entirely of him, is only to be understood in the Church.

123. Innumerable texts. Aponius, *In Cant.* (33); Alcuin, *In Eccl.* (PL 100: 710 B); Rabanus, *De laud.* (107: 279 BC); *In Ez.*, Bk. 8, c. 20: "Let us not be defiled with the phantoms of Egypt, that is to say, the inventions of philosophers and heretics, which are rightly called idols" (109: 718 D); Bruno of Segni, *In Is.* (*Sp. cas.*, 3, 13, 37, 58); Aelred (PL 195: 479 D); etc. Cf. Origen, *In Jer.*, h. 16, n. 9 (PG 13: 450 C); *Letter to Gregory Thaumaturgus* (Philoc. 13; Robinson, 66); etc.

124. Jerome, *Ep.* 43, n. 1: ". . . [Origen] discussed this day and night, so that reading might support prayer and prayer might support reading" (2, 92-3).

125. For his explication of Abraham's sacrifice, cf. D. Lerch, *Isaaks Opferung christlich gedeutet* (1950).

126. Origen, *In Rom.*, Bk. 2, c. 14 (PG 14: 919 B). Cf. Augustine, Anselm, etc.

127. Among many others: Bruno of Segni (PL 164: 204-5); Rupert (157: 455-6);

Abelard, *Ep.* 8 (178: 311-3); Honorius (172: 983 SC); H. Métel, *Ep.* 1 (314); Irimbert (Pez, 4, 218); Peter of Riga, *Aurora* (Pitra, 2, 165).

128. See above, n. 110.

129. Geoffrey Babion, serm. (PL 171: 864-7), etc. Cf. Origen, *In Jer.*, h. 2 and 3 (PG 13: 534-42), etc.

130. For the idea of "the region of dissimilitude," without prejudice to Augustine, "our texts of the twelfth century should make us think chiefly of Origen, an Origen who was probably known and decanted through Gregory of Nyssa, but contaminated by him with Plotinus": P. Courcelle, "Tradition néo-plat. et traditions chrétiennes de la 'région de dissemblance,' " *AHDLMA* 24 (1958), 21-2.

131. According to 1 Corinthians 2:11, 2 Corinthians 1:12, and Romans 8:16. This will end up being Saint Bernard's conception of the matter: Ph. Delhaye, in *S. Bernard th.*, 220-1.

132. "apex mentis," E. von Ivanka, in J. Lortz, *Bernhard von Clairvaux* (1955), 168-75. Origen's share was combined with that of Augustine.

133. "caritas ordinata," *In Cant.*, h. 2, n. 8 (O. Rousseau, SC, 37, 92-4); *In Cant.*, Bk. 3 (186-91). Cf. F. Guimet, "Notes en marge d'un texte de Richard de SV," *AHDLMA* 14 (1945), 380-6; H. Pétré, "Ordinata caritas, un enseignement d'Or. sur la charité," *RSR* 42 (1954), 40-57.

134. *In Cant.*, Bk. 2 (165, 170); h. 2, n. 3 (SC, 37, 84); Caesarius of Arles (Morin, vol. 1, 2, 735); Aimo, *In Ap.* (PL 117: 1081 AB); etc. H. Rahner, "Die Gottesgeburt; die Lehre der Kirchenväter von der Geburt Christi im Herzen des Glaübizen" (*Z. f. kath. Theol.* 59 [1935], 333-418); Matthäus Bernards, *Speculum virginum, Geistigkeit und Seelinben der Frau im Hochmittelalter* (1955).

135. *In Num.*, h. 27 (Mehat, SC, 29, 511-57): Jerome, Isidore, Bede (see below, n. 166), Rabanus, Peter Damian, *Glossa*, etc. Cf. Méhat, introduction, 13-7 and 48-64.

136. Cf. Paschasius, *In Matt.*, Bk. 11 (PL 120: 851 A); William of St. Thierry. Cf. J. Walsh, *RAM*, 35, 35.

137. St. T. Bettencourt, *Doctrina ascetica Origenis*, c. 3-4 (*St. ans.* 16 [1945], 35-88); *ibid.*, 48, on the harmony with nature that is rediscovered by the saint: these concepts "which were explicated by Origen, have always remained classical in Christian letters." On the three great themes of Origen, "the spiritual combat, the progress of the soul, and a union of love, which are at the wellspring of the three classical ways": W. Zeomans, *D. Sp.*, f. 25, 148.

138. "in omni divina historia, exteriora bella significant animae interiora," Goscelin, *Lib. confort.*, 2, citing "Jerome" on Joshua (Talbot, 56). Godfrey of Admont, *In Script.*, h. 2: "For us do not these fighting troops that are marshalled for war clearly signify that never-ending battle which will last right to the end of time for the elect, who have to fight against both the devil and the vices of the flesh, which resists the spirit?" (PL 174: 1066 B); etc.

139. "absque ulla corporeae adjectionis societate," *Periarch.*, Bk. 1, prologue, n. 8-9; Bk. 2, c. 2 (14-5, 110). Cf. Gennadius, *De eccl. dogm.* c. 12 (PL 58: 984 A); Bernard, *De consid.*, Bk. 5, c. 4 (182: 791-4). In Augustine, notwithstanding *Gen. litt.*, Bk. 3, c. 10 (34: 284-5) and *Div. quaest.* 47 (40: 31; attenuated by *Retract.*, Bk. 1, c. 26: Bardy 433-4), the orientation of thought is different; cf. *Enchir.*, n. 59 (Rivière, 208); *Civ. Dei*, Bk. 22, c. 29 (41: 796-7). William of Conches, in *De philosophia mundi*, Bk. 1 (PL 90: 1131 CD) cites

Gregory and Augustine on this subject. For his angelology Bernard owes much to Origen: E. Boissard, in *S. Bernard th.*, 116-8 and 134.

140. John 7: 37-8, 13:23, 19:34. Cf. H. Rahner, "De dominici pectoris fonte potavit" (*ZFKT*, 55, 1931). A. Lieske, *Die Theologie der Christusmystik bei Or.* (1938). H. Preuss, *Johannes in der Jehrenderten* (1939). Joseph Stierli, etc., *Le Coeur du Sauveur* (French translation by Ch. Munier, 1956).

141. *In Jo.*, tr. 18, n. 1 (PL 35: 1535-6). Cf. the preface, which is not Augustine's: "For he who reclined on the bosom of the Lord at the Last Supper drank a draught of heavenly wisdom more eminently than the rest of them did, for he drank from the very font of the Lord's bosom" (1378). This passage was taken up almost word for word by Alcuin and by Pseudo-Bede (92: 638 B). Cf. Ambrose, *In Luc.*, Bk. 7, n. 5 and 185 (Tissot, SC, 52, 10, 77-8); Bk. 10, n. 65 (178).

142. *H. fest.* 12: "These heights of contemplation are not understood except at the supper, where one reclines on the bosom of Jesus. In his bosom is the heart of man, and in the heart there is wisdom. For he who merits to grasp something of the divine savor at the Lord's Supper is filled, is illumined with true wisdom. . . . That Supper, I maintain, occurs when God comes to the heart of man and the heart of man is illumined . . ." (PL 174: 671 BC). Cf. h. 2 (639-42).

143. *H. dom.* 51: "those who are imitators of John, namely, spiritual men, who, following his example, have maintained their chastity and innocence from their youth, are at supper with the Lord and recline on the bosom of Jesus at this same supper. The bosom of Jesus is Sacred Scripture, because just as the heart is in the bosom, and life resides in the heart, so does that spiritual sense, by which man is made alive and comes to life again from within, lie hidden in Sacred Scripture, etc. . . . As for those who recline on the bosom of Jesus in this way, the Lord addresses them invisibly and ineffably amid banquet dishes of interior sweetness with words of this kind: I go to him who sent me etc." (PL 164: 339 BC).

144. Origen, *In Cant.*, Bk. 1: "In these matters it is certain that John is said to have rested in the guiding heart of Jesus and the interior meaning of his teaching, seeking and examining therein the treasures of wisdom and knowledge which were hidden in Christ Jesus" (93). The word "heart" itself did not figure in the Greek original here ("principale cordis," meaning "guiding heart," is Rufinus's translation of the Greek ἡγεμόνικον [= *hēgemonikon*]). Cf. K. Rahner, "Le Coeur de Jésus chez Or." (*RAM* 15 [1934]). In this regard, comparisons can be drawn with the following: *In Ez.*, h. 6 (PL 25: 738 A); *In Matt.*, vol. 12, n. 14 (215); *In Jer.*, h. 18, n. 9 (162-3). *In Ex.*, h. 11, n. 2: "Moses shows them the rock, which is Christ, and leads them to it, so that they may drink from it and slake their thirst. But if this rock has not been struck, it will not yield water. When it is struck, it produces wellsprings. For Christ is struck and set on the cross, producing the wellsprings of the New Testament. . . . Thus it was necessary for him to be struck. For if he had not been struck, and water and blood had not flowed forth from his side, all of us would be suffering thirst for the word of God" (254). Cf. Jerome (PL 25: 605 A, 683 D).

145. *In Ap.*, Bk. 1 (410 EF).

146. Sequence of Saint John the Evangelist (W. von den Steinem, 1948, 16):

> "In following the Messiah
> You rejected the soft bosom of a spouse,

So that you merited to drink
From the sacred streams of his bosom. . . ."

147. *De Jo. ev.* (tenth century?): P. Gall-Morel, *Latein. Hymnen des Mittel.* (1868), 161; *ibid.*, 162 (10-11th centuries). Cf. Milo, *De sobrietate*, Bk. 1, c. 3 (*P. Lat. aevi car.*, 3, 618).

148. *S.* 63 (PL 144: 858-9).

149. Cf. Rupert's vision as reported by Renier of Liège, in *De claris script. monast. sui*, Bk. 1, c. 11 (PL 204: 22 BC).

150. *In Cant.*, *s.* 62, n. 3: "Does he not seem to you to have immersed himself in the innermost depths of the Word and to have drawn from the profound core of his bosom a choice and holy portion of interior wisdom? etc." (PL 183: 1076 D).

151. *De invest. antichr.*, Bk. 1: Just as John leaned on the bosom of Jesus, "sometimes I have to lean on the sweet contemplation of Holy Scripture, in which are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, just as in the bosom of the Lord" (*L. de lite*, 3, 307).

152. Hymn for Saint John the Evangelist (Gautier, 93):

"This is Christ's well-beloved disciple,
Who leaned on Christ's bosom and drank his wisdom;

On the cross Christ commended his mother to him.
He took into his care the Virgin who had not known a man."

153. *Ep. 3, ad Hersaldum:* "It was Christ's desire to infuse with a richer spiritual knowledge the person who was given leave at supper to rest on his bosom, and quite rightly . . . this person is declared to have been a young man and virgin, etc." (PL 203: 30-1).

154. *Insinuationes*, Bk. 4, c. 4, n. 2, *In festo S. Jo. ev.* (1662 edition, 398-409).

155. *De naturis rer.*, Bk. 1, c. 1: "Like an eagle, seeking the heights on wings of grace and understanding, John deserves to take part in the lofty purposes of the high king. At supper he reclined on the bosom of the Lord and drank the health-giving waters of doctrine from the wellspring of the Savior. Holy Mother Church's garden of delights is irrigated with these waters" (4).

156. *In Zach.*, Bk. 3, c. 12, 10: a Hebrew word was poorly translated into Greek, and "on account of a similarity of letters an error took its rise. John the Evangelist, who drank wisdom from the bosom of the Lord, who was a Hebrew sprung from Hebrews, and whom the Savior loved very much, did not trouble himself greatly with what the letters signified in Greek. But he translated word for word, according to how he had chosen them in the Hebrew . . ." (PL 25: 1514 C).

157. M.W., 1, 464. Cf. J. Lécuyer, in *Cor Jesu*, 1 (1959), 209-29.

158. Besides certain particular interpretations in, for example, Ambrose Autpert, *De assumpt.* (PL 96: 264-9). Cf. Paschasius, *In Matt.*, Bk. 2: "At the same time the Blessed Evangelist . . . set the whole thing up, as I have said, in its particular details, even though it had yet to be worked out in its generalities" (120: 104 D).

159. On John 19: 26-7, which encompasses the spiritual maternity of Mary, compare Rupert (PL 169: 790 B) and Origen, *In Jo.*, Bk. 1, c. 4 (8-9). Cf. F. Quiévreux, "La maternité spirit. de la mère de Jésus dans S. Jean," *Vie sp.*, suppl. 20 (1952), 117-8. Cl. Dillenschneider, *Marie dans l'économie de la création rénovée* (1957), 316-30.

160. "amor extaticus," "beatus ignis amoris," "vulnus cordis"

161. M. Lot-Borodine, "L'aridité dans l'antiquité chrétienne," *Et. carmél.* [1937], 200; Origen, *In Cant.*, h. 2, n. 8-9 (Rousseau, SC, 37, 94-6); *In Cant. comm. prol.* (67); *In Jo.*, Bk. 1, c. 32 (41).

162. *De afflict. et lect.* (Leclercq, *Spir. de P. de Celle*, 236-7).

163. "Origène et l'exégèse du ps. L, 12-14," in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne (Mél. m. Goguel* [1950]), 180-94. The interpretation is taken up by Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Arnobius the Younger, Cassiodorus, W. Strabo, Aimo, Saint Bruno, Saint Bernard, Peter Lombard, and Gerhoh. Also Origenian is the mystery of Christ and the Church as contemplated in the creation of the sun and the moon.

164. *Etym.*, Bk. 6, c. 4, n. 4: "In an astonishing effort, Origen obtained the sixth and seventh editions and provided them along with the other editions" (PL 82: 236 C). Cf. *De eccl. off.*, Bk. 1, c. 12, n. 6 (83: 748 B).

165. "Isidore et Origène, Recherches sur les sources et l'influence des Quaest. in V. T. d'Isidore de Séville," in *Mél. bibliques. . . .* A. Robert, 537-47. Cf. PL 83: 207-424.

166. In other places, moreover, he depends on Origen through Isidore: see below, Chapter 4.5, n. 24. Elsewhere the intermediary is Jerome. Bede, *Ep.* 14, *De mansionibus filiorum Israel:* "And this is how the places of sojourn which brought those who had been liberated from the slavery of Egypt to the promised land are connected, as Blessed Jerome . . . explains. The ascent of the spiritual virtues is an affair that requires a seeking of the heights. Through these virtues the Church of Christ and every faithful soul are busy ascending in haste to the sight of the God of gods in Sion in the hope of freedom, etc." (PL 94: 699-702; 701 C).

167. *Loc. cit.*, 542.

168. *In Jo.* (PL 165: 465-6).

Notes to Chapter Four
§2. The Twofold Equation

1. M. de Wulf, *H. de la phil. méd.*, 6th ed., 1, 106. *Dionysiaca*, 1, 67 and n 3.

2. De Wulf, 109.

3. St. Martin 1, etc. (*Dionysiaca*, 1).

4. M. D. Chenu, *Th. au XIIe siècle*, 132: "The psychological reality of grace and free will, the two human and divine freedoms, which the Pelagian controversy would establish forever in the West, can only find its place with difficulty in this synergy of the hierarchical doctrine of beings. Here the Christian Dionysius yields to Neoplatonism and its constraining mediations."

5. *Ep.* 14 (MGH, *Ep.* 6, 159). Cf. *P. lat. aevi car.*, 3, 548.

6. Evidence is assembled in *Dionysiaca*, 1, 65-77.

7. Michael the Stammerer sent Louis the Pious the Greek text of Dionysius, which was translated by Hilduin. Charles the Bald then invited John Scotus to make a new translation of this same text, a translation that would be corrected and glossed by Anastasius.

8. Letter 13, to Charlemagne, from John VIII (MGH, *Ep. kar. aevi*, 5, 431-4); letter 17 to the same (440-1). On Anastasius: A. Lapôtre, *De Anastasio Bibliothecario* (1885); *Le pape Jean VIII* (1895), 40-1; L. Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'Etat pontifical* (1898),

115-28; E. Perels, *Papst Nicolaus I und Anastasius bibl.* (Berlin, 1920). Cf. M. Cappuyns, *Jean Sc. Er.* (1923), 154-61.

9. Notker the Stammerer, *De int. div. Script.*, c. 1: "Make an effort to learn Origen's marvelously articulated homilies on Exodus and Leviticus" (PL 131: 995 B); c. 2: on the psalms "Origen is first and foremost among the Greeks" (995 C).

10. H. Margival, "Richard Simon," c. 4 (*RHLR* [1897], 233).

11. F. Prat, *Origène*, 63.

12. See below, Chapter 4.3.

13. Leclercq, *L'amour des lettres*, 90-1 and 94.

14. Dom Olivier Rousseau, introduction to the *Hom. sur le Cant.* (SC, 37, 1954), 54. Together with the great Latin doctors, Origen is the most appreciated of commentators: Leclercq in *la Maison-Dieu*, 5, 24.

15. *De virg.*, c. 59: "For unlike Origen, renowned teacher of the Greeks, who, as he was entering his eleventh year of age, at the beginning of his manhood, was perfectly accomplished in almost all the philosophical disciplines, that is to say, arithmetic, geometry, music, astronomy, astrology, and mechanics, we have presumed to adopt a career that involves dictating to attentive clerks and antiquaries, who are busy transcribing" (MGH, *A. ant.*, 15, 320). The passage is inspired by Jerome, *De viris ill.*, c. 54 (PL 23: 665-7).

16. Details in Fontaine, 756-7, 868-9.

17. *Prognost.*, Bk. 2, c. 28 (PL 96: 490 A); *Antikeim.*, Bk. 1: "We have found these matters . . . explained in this way by Origen" (96: 614 B).

18. See above, Chapter 4.1.

19. *Chronicon*, a. 206 (MGH, *Ser.*, 1, 545).

20. "praecipuus doctor," *Chron.*, vol. 2, Bk. 3, c. 2 (PL 106: 1175 D).

21. "Celeberrimus doctor," Ekk. Urang. (PL 154: 468 B).

22. "Munimenta fidei" (Leclercq, *St. ans.* [1948], 62 and 74).

23. *De int. div. Scr.*, c. 1-2 (see above, n. 9); c. 4: he has written "many, marvelous things" on the Letter to the Romans (PL 131: 997 C).

24. Humb. Wirciburg.: We have no shortage of authors on the Heptateuch, "for indeed we have Origen, Victorinus, Ambrose . . . and the other Fathers" (MGH, *Ep.* 5, 440; *inter ep. Rab., ep.* 26).

25. "doctores et majores nostri," *Ep.* 2 (see above, Chapter 4.1, n. 62).

26. *De div. nat.*, Bk. 5, c. 27: "The great Origen, most careful investigator of things" (PL 122: 929 A).

27. M. Cappuyns, *Jean Scot Origène*, 197.

28. Cf. Alb. Miliolus, *Liber de temporibus:* "Note the day and age of the great Origen" (MGH, *Scr.*, 31, 385).

29. "Origen is water from the sea. Gregory Nazianzen is water from a spring. Cyprian should be taken up in his entirety. Jerome is water from a cistern. Augustine is water from the clouds in the sky . . ." (Bischoff, *S. Er.*, 6, 201, n. 4).

30. . . . Exhinc Origenis, acer studioque notandus
Praecluis expositor Graecali famine promptus:
Nec modico sumptu pendebat pagina dives,
Quam variare stilis instabat Graecia tantis.
Hieronymus tamen haud potuit hunc ferre laborem . . .

P. lat. aevi car., 3, 259.

31. *De nom. hebr.*, preface: "Origen, whom no one, unless he is ignorant, will deny to be a Church master after the apostles" (PL 23: 772 A; Lagarde's edition, p. 2); *In Ez.*, preface: *idem*, "according to the opinion of Didymus the seer" (25: 583 D). According to Rufinus, *H. eccl.*, Bk. 2, c. 7 (21: 517 A), it is Saint Anthony who would have called Didymus "the seer." Here Jerome reproduces the epithet intentionally. Cf. Jerome, *In Gal.* (26: 309 A).

32. *Trop. in Os. et Amos:* "Origen, supreme in doctrine after the Apostles" (PL 156: 339 A).

33. *Ep.* 8, in the course of a lengthy passage on wells that is an imitation of Origen: "the homilies of the great Christian philosopher Origen on Genesis. . . . That zealous digger of spiritual wells" (PL 178: 311-3; 312 A).

34. *Ep.* 7: "Let me omit the rest of them, while, for the common good, I bring forth the distinguished doctors of the Church: namely, Origen, Ambrose, and Jerome. And the first of these is the greatest of Christian philosophers" (PL 178: 253 D). Abelard is well aware that Jerome often copies Origen: *Sic et Non*, prol. (1342-3); *In Rom.*, pref. (180: 547 AB).

35. *In Rom.*, pref. (PL 180: 547 AB).

36. "tertius ordo," *De script.*, c. 6 (PL 175: 15 D).

37. *Apologeticum pro Petro Ab. c. Bernardum* (PL 178: 1863 C).

38. *Ep. Fulconis ad Petrum Ab.:* "That Origen, whose high wisdom is proclaimed and fostered everywhere" (PL 178: 374 A). He adds: "except for the fact that he corrected certain slight errors, laying the blame, however, on his disciple, Ambrose, as blessed Jerome says, inasmuch as Ambrose secretly published his writings before the time was right."

39. *Vita prima Bern.*, Bk. 3, pref. (PL 185: 301 D). Unpublished commentary on the Song of Songs (Leclercq, *Irenikon* [1951], 429).

40. *In nat. Dom., s.* 1, n. 8: "The name of Jesus is, as Origen's more famous tongue described it, dear and glorious" (PL 184: 832 A).

41. It is probable that from the language of Origen we get expressions such as: "My Lord Jesus" (Bernard: PL 183: 208 D; Oger, 184: 879 B); or "sweet Jesus" (Bruno of Segni, *In Lev.*, pref.; 164: 377 B); or yet again: "I think that the Lord approaches Jerusalem every day, coming from Bethphage" (*S. in dom. palm.*; 184: 184, 870 C), etc.

42. "Et tu, quid sentis, Origenes, inclyte doctor?" *De vera pace*, c. 7 (Wilmart, 14).

43. *Ep.* 167 (PL 202: 610 B).

44. *In Cant.*, pref.: "Origen's honey, Gregory's colors, Bede's perfumes, blessed Bernard's fragrant balsam gum" (PL 206: 17 A).

45. *Sent.*, Bk. 1, d. 9, c. 4, n. 96: "Origen demonstrates quite clearly that it can and ought to be said that: The Son is always begotten. This seems to be opposed to the following words of Gregory . . . : we cannot say that he is always begotten. But lest such great authors should seem to contradict each other in an affair of this significance, let us interpret these words of Gregory liberally" (Quar., 2d ed., vol. 1, 1916, 69-70). The end of this text is cited by Landgraf (*ZFKT* 79 [1957], 432, n. 102), who does not, however, cite the first phrase, in which Origen's name appears.

46. *Verb. abbr.*, c. 80 (PL 206: 241 AB).

47. "philosophus acutissimus, et litteratissimus christianus, et ferventissimus in fide," *Polycr.*, Bk. 8, c. 6 (PL 199: 424 D).

48. *Polycr.*, Bk. 7, c. 5, regarding Plato: "If a book which is derived from his teachings is disparaged, Origen, Jerome, and Augustine, who trust in the testimony of all the philosophers, are sufficient in his praise" (PL 199: 147 A).

49. "qui adhuc exstant et multos informant"

50. *De libris a se scriptis:* "Origen, no less than Jerome and Augustine, sweated and toiled at such useful work . . . in their own time they also published distinguished books of letters, which are still extant and enlighten many people. . . . Since Origen and Jerome and the other sacred writers and doctors of the Church have shed much light . . . on the bride of Christ" (*Opera*, J. S. Brewer, 1, 1861, 416, 418).

51. "Accedat primus Maximus ille et antiquissimus Scripturarum interpres, Origenem dico, qui . . . centum et quinquaginta annis et amplius adhuc ante Ambrosium, Hieronymum, Augustinum et reliquos sacrarum litterarum interpretes, suo motuque in divinarum legum explanationibus desudavit, et primus absque exemplo et solus sine socio quantum litteris illis potuisset edocuit." *Ep.* 1 (*Opera*, I. A. Giles, 2, 1846, 211).

52. "Urbs famae celebris Tyrus est, quam sumptibus amplis
Vicit Alexander atque labore gravi.
At laudes urbis facit ingens laus Origenis;
Tanti doctoris corpus honorat eam."

De laud. div. sap. dist., 5, v. 955-8 (462-3).

53. Abelard, *In Rom.* (PL 178: 935 A); School of Abelard, *In Rom.*: "Origen, who knew the Old Testament and the New" (Landgraf, 15); Ph. of Harv., *Resp. de damnat. Sal.* (PL 93: 652-3).

54. The epithet appears in a number of manuscripts: Dechanet, *op. cit.*, 47, n. 2. On the other hand, no provision seems to have been made for the surname that Jerome loved to give to Origen, "Chalcenterus," the man with bronze insides — a surname which had been that of Didymus of Alexandria, a lexicographer of the first century.

55. Probably because of the way in which Jerome had cited name and surname together. *Ep.* 33, n. 4: "Let us turn to our Adamantius and our Chalcenterus, who put so much sweat and toil into his commentaries on the Holy Scriptures, that it was with justice that he received the name meaning 'adamantine'" (2, 40). *Ep.* 43, n. 1: "truly Adamantius and our Chalcenterus" (92). In modern times, Possevin, for example, speaks of the surname (*App. sacer.*, 2, 179). Similarly, Bergier (*Dict.*, article "Origène," 1852 edition, 4, 241), etc. Eusebius had written (*Ecclesiastical History*, Bk. 6, c. 14, n. 10): "As for Adamantios (for Origen also bore this name) . . ." (Bardy, vol. 2, 108; SC, 41; cf. the note).

56. Pliny (in *Hist. nat.*, Bk. 17, n. 4) had indicated the hardness of adamantine stone, which cannot be damaged by fire or sword. Origen himself (*In Jer.*, h. 3, n. 1) had shown that it was "long-lasting, not to be overcome or worn down" by hammer blows. He asked himself whether or not he would, during the time of persecution, be "truly adamantine" (PL 25: 607 D); cf. h. 12: "with an iron stylus and an adamantine nail" (683 D). Cassian, *Coll.* 6, c. 12: "The mind of the just man . . . ought to be like a sort of adamantine seal, so that our mind always preserves the inviolable shape of its own characteristics etc." (Pichery, SC, 42, 238). A verse sketch in the *Liber de gemmis* of Marbodius, n. 1 (PL 171: 1739-40).

57. "Perpenditur et cognoscitur Origenis sermo per sententiosam moralitatem et

auctoritatum abundantiam." And Notker, *De Interpr.*, c. 1: "If you want morality, turn your thoughts to Origen" (PL 131: 995 A).

58. "Solus Origenes, cum doctos vinceret omnes
In libris aliis, tandem in libro Salomonis
Ipse sui victor fuit, ejus Cantica tractans . . ."

P. of Riga, *Aurora, Incipit in Cant.* (according to Jerome). Leclercq, *Irenikon*, 435. (Another manuscript gives a somewhat different version, which is cited by Helmut Riedlinger, 1958). Also, while the commentaries on the Song of Songs that we owe to Pelagius and Jerome are lost, Origen's commentary was recopied everywhere (Leclercq, *St. ans.*, 20, 205).

59. Capitulary of 786-800. In this homiliary, six homilies are given as being Origen's (PL 95: 1189, 1196 . . .). Cf. Klost. and Benz, *op. cit.* (TU, 47), 112-33.

60. Origen only disappeared from the office when all uncanonized authors were excluded from it (Breviary of Saint Pius V).

61. The catalog of liturgical manuscripts in the Vatican Library that was published in 1897 by Ehrensberger mentions 36 of Origen's homilies scattered through various lectionaries that date from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries. For the sixteenth century: P. Battifol, *H. du bréviaire romain*, 3d edition, 205-6 and 231-3.

62. "decus Ecclesiae," Belleval Manuscript, twelfth century (Leclercq, *Iren.*, 434).

63. *Rat. div. off.*, c. 52: "In general, there are those who have left their homilies to posterity: Augustine, Gregory, Bede, and Origen" (PL 202: 69 D). Joachim of Flora, *Sup. 4 ev.*, speaks of "Origen in that homily which is annually read in church" (Buon., 36); It is the homily *In Matt.* which is noted above in Chapter 4.2, n. 111.

64. References in J. Chatillon, *Sermons et opusc. inédits de Richard de SV* (1951), xxvi and in Leclercq, *Iren.*, 429-30, note.

65. Prudentius of Troyes to Vénilon of Sens in 851 (MGH, *Ep.* 5, 632), on John Scotus. He read extracts from John Scotus: "After they had been gone through and carefully examined, I found the poison of Pelagian falsehood in them, and several times the madness of Origen, and the rage of the Collyridian heretics."

66. *Ep.* 84, n. 8 (4, 134-5).

67. As was Otto of Freising, *Chronicon*, Bk. 3, c. 27: "believing that that gospel saying . . . should be discharged even to the letter" (MGH, *Scr.*, 20, 187); Ph. of Harvengt, *De contin. cler.*, c. 67 (PL 203: 754 D); Fulc. (178: 374 B); John of Salisbury, *Polycr.*, Bk. 8, c. 6: "by castrating himself he fled most effectually from fornication, and what is more, he even took precautions against any hint of it that could be fled from" (199: 724 D); etc.

68. Gerald of Wales, *Gemma ecclesiast.*: "I have introduced these matters to you not so much out of concern that they should be imitated, but rather so that by way of them I might show his zeal for cleanness and his passion for continence as something that can be admired more than imitated" (*Opera*, 2, 268).

69. Rabanus, *Ep.* 23, preface to the commentary on the Letters of Paul: "For all the doctors themselves were Catholic, except for Origen, whose opinions I accepted, but only just those which I believed to have been proposed in a Catholic sense. As for the rest of his opinions, I did not bother with them" (MGH, *Ep.* 5, 430; PL 111: 1276 A).

70. Rabanus, *In Ez.*, Bk. 8, c. 18; following Jerome (PL 110: 706-7).

71. Bruno of Segni, *In Lev.*, c. 7 (PL 164: 405 C).

72. Ph. of Harv., *Ep.* 6 (PL 203: 47 A). See below, Chapter 4.4.

73. Autpert, *In Ap.*, Bk. 1: "In this there is no doubt that the impious dogma of Origen is made void, since, on account of an infinite space of eternal night, the just are said to be unable to cross over to enjoy fellowship with the impious, and those who are evil are said to be unable to cross over to enjoy fellowship with the just" (418 B).

74. *Ibid.*, Bk. 10 (644 H).

75. Zach. of Besançon, *In unum ex quatuor, praef. tertia:* "the perversity of Origen's errors" (PL 186: 38 D).

76. *ZFKT* 79 (1957), 420. Landgraf draws attention to a manuscript of the twelfth century entitled "The Cases in Which Origen Erred." Another manuscript recapitulates the errors noticed in the *De principiis*.

77. "ille praecipuus doctor," John of Spain to Alvarus: "Origen, that renowned doctor."

78. The response of Alvarus: "Since you bring forward to us as a witness that old heretic Origen, saying that he is a renowned doctor, and you are not aware yourself that he was condemned by the Fathers, know that I am not intimidated by what he says." *Ep.* 3, n. 3; *Ep.* 4, n. 10 (J. Madoz, *Epistolario de Alv. de Cordoba* [1948], 105 and 124). Cf. Jerome, *In Gal.*, prol.: "and that old Alexandrian heretic" (PL 26: 309 A).

79. ". . . Quem utinam tam catholicum suscepissemus dogmatisten, quam fidum admiramur interpretem!" *loc. cit.*, n. 44 (*Opera*, 2, 211).

80 *Ep.* 82, n. 7, to Theophilus (4, 118-9). Cf. *Apol. adv. libros Ruf.*, Bk. 2, n. 34: "Our Origen — I call him ours because of his learning and genius, not because of the truth of his doctrines."

81. *Ep.* 84, n. 2 and 7, to Pamm. and Oc. (4, 126, 133). Cf. *Ep.* 61, n. 1-2, to Vig. (3, 110-2); *Ep.* 62, n. 2 to Tranq. (3, 115-6); *Ep.* 82, n. 7, to Theoph. (4, 118); *Ep.* 85, n. 3-4, to Paulinus (4, 139-40); *Ep.* 119, n. 11, to Min. and Alex.: "In youth and extreme age I declare that Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea were most learned men, but that they erred with regard to the truth of their doctrines" (PL 22: 979); *Ap. adv. libros Ruf.*, Bk. 3, c. 9: "We erred as youth, let us change our ways as old men" (PL 23: 464 B); but Bk. 1, c. 22 (415-6).

82. "Ex nimio fervore quo sensum suum immiscuit profunditatibus Scripturarum sanctarum quas amabat . . ." Elis. of Schönau, *Lib. visionum*, 3, 5 (Roth, 62-3; Leclercq, *Irenikon*, 437). In alluding to Origen's errors (see below, Chapter 4.4) Abelard would also refer without distinction to his "explanations and opinions" (PL 178: 1170 B).

83. "Quis haereticus, Ecclesiarum magister aliquando dici potuit?" *Apol.*, Bk. 1, n. 21 (PL 21: 560 A); cf. Bk. 2, n. 13, 16 (586 B, 597 C).

84. "Defensio Origenis," "Purgatio Origenis," Leclercq, *Iren.*, 434.

85. Wenrich of Trier, *Ep.*, n. 5 (*L. de lite*, 1, 292). The passages cited are *In Num.*, h. 15; *In Lev.*, h. 14. Manegold, *Ad Gebehard.*, c. 45: "Regarding those unjustly anathematized, we do not deny the examples of Gregory, Origen, Augustine, and Jerome that have been introduced. Indeed, we accept these examples with all due reverence, especially since they seem to work in our favor and to put an end to those folk utterly" (*L. de lite*, 1, 390; around 1080?).

86. "quae catholica fides perniciosa multumque improbanda respuit," Simeon of Durham (Leclercq, "Ecrits monastiques . . ." *Med. St.* 15 [1933], 104). Cf. Jerome (PL 22: 603, 606, 749-50).

87. Simeon, *ibid.*. In *In Ez.* h. 1, n. 2, Origen "seems to say that Sodom and Gomorrah

could not have repented, so that, having been punished in this life, the inhabitants of these two cities could be pardoned in the next: 'I believe that you have read these words of Origen's, you recall that you have controverted these words with astonishment' . . . . In order to refute this doctrine, Simeon cites Maximus, Gregory the Great, a canon from the council prohibiting suicide, Augustine, Jerome, and Ambrose. All these texts are invoked against the partisans of an error that has been properly ascertained: 'they strive to deny repentance to those who have fallen.' It is a matter merely, it is clear, of one very particular text of Origen, and it is not clear that in this text Origen is responsible for the error that occasions the debate" (Leclercq, *loc. cit.*, 105-6).

88. Anonymous, *Lib. de paenitentia* (twelfth century), c. 14, The opinions of the Fathers are explained . . . : "Origen on Leviticus: in the case of more serious accusations the time for repentance is granted only once. And he says this about the common observance of repentance, which in previous times etc." (PL 213: 878 B).

89. *Ep.* 124, to Avitus (PL 22: 1059-72); etc. The points that Jerome touched on elsewhere were collected in this letter, according to a somewhat different order. There is a summary in *Apol. adv. libros Ruf.*, Bk. 2, c. 12 (23: 435-6).

90. Rabanus, *Cler. inst.*, Bk. 2, c. 58, *De haeresibus:* "The Origenians arose at the instigation of Origen. They said that the Son could not see the Father and that the Holy Spirit could not see the Son. They also say that souls sinned at the beginning of the world and that for the diversity of their sins they merited diverse bodies, which were chains, as it were, extending all the way from heaven to earth, and that this is the reason the world came to be" (PL 107: 374 D). Cf. Jerome, *Ep.* 124, 2 and 6 (22: 1060, 1064); *Ap. adv. libros Ruf.*, Bk. 2, c. 11 (23: 434-5); Epiphanius, *Haer.*, 64 (PG 41: 1076 CD); Theophilus, *Ep. synod.* (Jerome, *Ep.* 92; 4, 150-1).

91. Bernard, *De erroribus Ab.*, Bk. 2, c. 1, n. 3 (PL 182: 1057 B); Gautier of Saint Victor, *C. quatuor labyr., add.* (P. Glorieux, 326). Cf. Jerome, *Ep.* 124 (22: 1060-1).

92. Bede, *In Marc.* 1 (PL 92: 134 D). Rabanus (see above, n. 90). John of Spain to Alvarus, *Ep.* 2, n. 5: Bishop Bracarius explained "that the souls of men were not to be found from the beginning among the other intellectual natures, nor were they created at once, as Origen imagines" (J. Madoz, 168). Petrus Scholasticus, *Apol. pro P. Ab.:* "Or if you ascribe the origin of the soul to this, the fact that it took its rise in the past, that is to say, it was made in heaven . . . , you are falling prey to the vicious depravity of Origen, who in his book the *Periarchôn,*" etc. (178: 1866 C); Arnold of Bonneval, *Hexaem.* (189: 1522 C). Cf. Jerome, c. 3, 8, 13 (22: 1061, 1066-7, 1071); *De ps. 78* (*An. mar.*, 3, 2, 67); Augustine, *Civ. Dei*, Bk. 11, c. 23 (41: 336-7). Leo, *Ep.* 35, c. 3 (54: 807 C). As early as Gregory Nazianzen, *Or.* 37, c. 15 (PG 36: 300-1).

93. Prudentius of Troyes, *De praed. c. J. Sc.:* "And we believe that we should not pass over in silence the fact that although you have chosen to have sentiments that are congruent with those of Origen in other matters, you will take up an opposite position when it comes to the kind of punishment. For he supposed and thought that the fire and worms of the impious was consciousness of their own offenses"; Jerome was opposed to this (PL 115: 1338 B). Cf. Jerome, c. 7 (22: 1065-6); *Apol. adv. libros Ruf.*, Bk. 2, c. 7 (23: 428-3).

94. "argumentatio venenata Scripturarum"

95. Jerome, *C. Joannem Hieros.*, c. 26-33 (PL 23: 376-85).

96. *Periarchôn*, Bk. 2, c. 9; Bk. 3, c. 5 (163-4, 271-2); Aimo, *In Rom.:* "Blessed Augustine censures Origen very sharply, because under this heading of creature he includes not

only the beasts, but also the sun and the other stars and the angels as well, together with man, saying that all things are subject to vanity and, what is more, groan in their travail" (PL 117: 432 AB).

97. *Ep.* 124, c. 4 (PL 22: 1062-3). C. *Joannem Hier.*, c. 16-19 (23: 368-71). But in *In Is.* (24: 350 A), Jerome affirms the animation of the stars; In *In Eccl.* (23: 1016 C) he suggests that this is plausible.

98. *Ad Oros.*, n. 11: without pronouncing on the matter, he was inclined to suppose that "there is no kind of creature which cannot be perceived in man; and thus every creature aches and groans in him, awaiting the revealing of the sons of God." Cf. n. 14: are the stars animated? he does not know this and many other things: "perhaps those who are more learned will teach you these things"; and he cites Sirach 3:21: "Seek not what is too difficult for you, nor investigate what is beyond your power . . ." (PL 42: 675-8). Cf. *Gen. litt.*, Bk. 2, c. 18, n. 38 (34: 779-80); *Civ. Dei*, Bk. 13, c. 16, n. 2 (41: 388); *Ench.*, c. 15, n. 58 (Rivière, 207).

99. Cf. J. Fontaine, *REL* 31 (1953), 284-5, 291.

100. "Omnis creatura, id est homo, in quo est omne genus creaturarum," Pseudo-Hugh, *In Rom.*, q. 204 (PL 176: 481 D). Atto of Vercelli, *In Rom.*: "Vanity. . . . This judgment has been variously explained by the learned doctors. . . . Nothing is more vain than man . . . except, perhaps, if we understand the word the way the philosophers do, for they claim that all these things are animated. . . . But this meaning, because it has a near likeness with error, must be utterly repudiated. Others, however, like Origen, understand the angels to be creatures. . . . Therefore the fact remains that we understand men to be more blessed than angels. . . . Blessed Augustine investigated and elucidated this question in quite great depth . . ." (134: 205 B). Hervaeus, *In Rom.* (181: 711 C). *Mutatis mutandis*, today's theology follows Origen rather than Augustine.

101. *Ad Greg.*, with regards to Hilary: "And I fairly marvel at the holy and very learned man, that he should make use of Origen's trifling nonsense. I can in no wise be persuaded, most holy father, to believe that the stars of heaven have rational spirits" (MGH, *Ep. Greg.*, 1, 60). Cf. Gregory, *In ev.*, h. 2, n. 29 (PL 76).

102. *In Rom.*: "For I know that the empty-headed heretics have bandied about many silly, impious notions on this subject. Because the Apostle said in a universal way that all of creation groans etc., some, like Origen, say that even more worthy creatures, that is to say, the loftiest of the angels and the sublimest of the powers ache and groan, before we are completely freed" (PL 191: 1445 B).

103. Bede, *In Hexaem.*, Bk. 2: "That heresy of Origen's is refuted and condemned, for it presumed to expound the teaching that there is an infinite recurrence of cosmic cycles which follows the same order" (PL 91: 109 CD). In fact, it is well known that Origen fought against this kind of error more than once when he fought against "metensomatosis" and the stoic cycles. In this vein we have *In Matt.*, vol. 13, n. 1 (173-6); C. *Cels.*, Bk. 8, c. 72 (2, 288); etc.

104. Remigius, *In Is.* (PL 116: 833 CD); Aimo (?), *In Ap.*, Bk. 4: "In this place Origen is undone, for he said that after a thousand years etc." (117: 1119 D). Martin of Léon, *Exp. Ap.*, in 14, 12: "In this place Origen's error is openly destroyed, for he said that after a thousand years the damned return to life and that the just will return again to their punishment" (209: 375 A).

105. Anselm of Laon, *In ps. 118, Res.* (PL 116: 628 B).

106. "nescio quam passivam divinitatem pro (daemonum) redemptione iterum in

aere invisibiliter pati," Arnold of Bonneval, *Hexaem.* (PL 199: 1522 A). Cf. Sulpicius Severus, *Dial.* 1, c. 7 (Halm, 158-9); etc.

107. *Ep.* 124, c. 3 and 10 (PL 22: 1061-2, 1068-9). Cf. Augustine, *Civ. Dei*, Bk. 21, c. 14 (41: 731-2); Bk. 12, c. 13, n. 2 (361); *De haer.*, c. 43 (42: 33-4).

108. *Prosperi Tironis Epit. Chronicon* (c. 440; MGH, *Chr. minora*, 1, 437). *Chr. integrum* (PL 51: 567 CD).

109. "origeniani"

110. *Sup. Parab. Sal.*, Bk. 1, c. 2: "All who enter her place do not return. By saying they go to her place he means death, not the woman. . . . But it is right to speak against the followers of Origen, for they promise remission of sins and eternal life in the kingdom of heaven to heretics, harlots, and whole gangs of profligate sinners, and more than that, to the devil himself and his angels, countless ages after the universal judgment, even when it has been completed" (PL 91: 948 A). Cf. *In Matt.* 25 (92: 110 A); *In Marc.* 3 (164 C).

111. *In Prov. Sal.*, Bk. 2, c. 11: "Once an impious man is dead, there is no more hope. Alas, but Origen, in his wretchedness, bypassed this judgment . . ." (PL 111: 716 A).

112. *In Is.*, c. 24 (PL 116: 833 CD); cf. c. 30 (872 CD).

113. *Defl.* Bk. 1: "with an excess of confidence in the mercy of God, he preached that the devil could be saved . . ." (PL 157: 754 BC),

114. *In 1 Reg.*, Bk. 2, c. 4, n. 33-4 (PL 79: 144 AB). Cf. *Mor.*, Bk. 34, c. 20, n. 38 (76: 739 BC).

115. *S. in adv.* (PL 171: 346 A).

116. "Frustra Origenes spondet liberationem post multos annos malis hominibus et ipsis daemonibus," *Sent.*, Bk. 8, c. 25 (PL 186: 999 C). Cf. P. of Poitiers, *Sent.*, Bk. 4, c. 8 (211: 1167 C).

117. *Th. Chr.*, Bk. 5: "Otherwise, since God does everything that he desires to do and he desires that all men be saved, surely we would be forced to declare, in accordance with that detestable error of Origen's, that he has extended his salvation even to demons" (PL 178: 1323 A).

118. "dogma platonicum," "verborum monstra et rationum portenta, non christiana dogmata," *Hexaem.* (PL 189: 1522 AB).

119. "Non credas Origeni dogmatizanti!" *S.* 15: "And do not believe the dogmatizing Origen, who says that the Lord will not be angry eternally, and that at some point he will even have mercy on the demons" (PL 198: 1764 D; 171: 429 A). Cf. Gautier of Saint Victor, *C. quatuor labyr.*, Bk. 3, c. 3, summarizing P. of Poitiers (Glorieux, 249). An addition to the *Hist. scol.* makes a new attempt: *L. Gen.*, c. 15 (198: 1069 D).

120. *Dial.* 1, c. 6 (Halm, 158); but Sulpicius is astonished at them, as if they were an improbability.

121. *Commonit.* c. 17, n. 23 (Rauschen, 38).

122. *De inst. div. litt.*, c. 1: "Concerning whom it is said conclusively: When he did things well . . ." (PL 70: 1112 A); Manegold, *In ps. 54* (93: 768 D); Ph. of Harvengt, *Ep.* 23 (203: 172 A).

123. "Ubi bene, nemo melius; ubi male, nemo pejus," with a slight variant in Alb. Miliolus, *L. de temporibus*, c. 17: "just as he was better in things that he did well, so was he worse in things that he did badly" (MGH, *Scr.*, 31, 382).

124. "pejus"

125. It is well established that several of the anathemas of 543 and 553 have no

foundation in the known texts of Origen. They are, moreover, far from agreeing with each other on every point, and these two lists also differ to a significant degree from the list of errors with which Origen was reproached earlier and which were rebuffed by Pamphilus.

126. Letter to friends from Alexandria, in Rufinus, *De adult. librorum Or.:* "Some of those who gladly accept that their neigbors should be slandered ascribe the crime of blasphemy to us and our teaching. This is something they never heard from us. They should look into this matter themselves, unwilling though they are to observe the command that says that 'slanderers will not possess the kingdom of God,' and claiming as they do that I say that the father of evil and perdition and of those who are ejected from the kingdom of God, that is to say, the devil, is to be saved. This is something that even someone who is mentally disturbed and clearly insane cannot say. But it seems in no wise strange to me, if my teaching is adulterated by my enemies and is marred by the same kind of adulteration as mars the Letter of Saint Paul the Apostle, etc."

127. Aimo, *Hist. sacrae epit.,* Bk. 6, c. 3 (PL 118: 850 BC); Rufinus, *De adult. libr. Or.* (PG 17: 615-32). Cf. *Praedestinatus,* Bk. 1, haer. 43: "Perverse doctors have adulterated our Origen, a Catholic writer of treatises . . ." (PL 53: 600 AC).

128. *Dial.* 1, 6: ". . . his defenders claim that these have been falsified. I marvel at . . ." (Halm, 158).

129. *Common* , c. 17, n. 23 (G. Rauschen, 41).

130. "non statuit ex sententia, sed disseruit ex opinione," Aimo, *ibid.* (850 C). Cf. Huet: "He tried candidly to absolve Origen of the charge, declaring that the errors were either inflicted on him by heretics or else proposed by him not as a decisive judgment but as an opinion" (1137 A).

131. *De princip.,* Bk. 1, preface, n. 3 (9).

132. "primus absque exemplo et solus sine socio," Herbert of Bosham; see above, n. 50.

133. "quaedam prava et haeretica"

134. *In 1 Cor.,* c. 2: "He himself will be safe. . . . This should not be understood as coming from a learned doctor who is a heretic, but from a Catholic who has not taught correctly. For even in the case of books written by holy doctors, which the Church reads authentically, bad and heretical things are sometimes found. Neither the books nor their authors, however, are condemned on this account. Let the prudent reader make a thorough reading of their books and he will find that what I say is true" (PL 181: 842 CD).

135. *Ep.* 40, to Jerome, n. 9: "I desired and still desire that you as a prudent teacher should make known to us those very errors of his by which which that man, great as he was, is proven to have departed from the faith" (PL 33: 157). F. Cavallera, *S. Jérôme,* 2, 48, dates this letter to 399.

136. He always speaks of them impersonally and indicates those who deal in them by the use of plurals (PL 42: 669-78). Orosius was already doing this in his questioning. He spoke only of the two Aviti, his fellow citizens ("They handed on, they spoke, they preached, they desired"), not of Origen, whose writings he does not seem to have read. However, in *Liber apol.,* c. 1, he counts Origen, together with Priscillian and Jovinian, among the authors of "abominable doctrines" (Zangemeister, 604).

137. *C. quat. labyr., add.* (Glorieux, 308, 326).

138. Bede knew it. In the ninth century Remigius of Lyon mentioned it, Prudentius of Troyes cited a passage from it, and Sedulius Scotus published extracts from it: Laistner, in *A Monument to St. Jerome* (1952), 246.

139. "laus de Hieronymo"

140. ". . . Dogmatis ac fidei nostrae pacis requiei
Illum vesanus pavet hostis Jovinianus,
Arrius et Photinus, Origenes atque Rufinus.
Non abit immunis quem tu, Jeronime, punis!
Tu pestes rabidas verbi mucrone trucidas. . . ."

Vita S. Malchi, 6, 473-4 (A., *RMAL*, 2, 318).

141. As is the case with P. Koetschau, who takes Jerome as an authority, while the version of Rufinus (279-91) is in alignment here with *C. Cels.*, Bk. 6, c. 71 (2, 141), which dismisses such monism. Or W. Völker, as discussed by H. Crouzel, *RAM* 33 (1957), 199-200.

142. Jerome, *Ep.* 124, c. 3: "Once again the beginning arises from the end and the end from the beginning . . . and thus everything is mixed up together" (PL 22: 1061); c. 10: "and all substance is to be changed into one very neat and elegant body that is purer than any brilliant splendor" (1069). Cf. Filastre, *Haer.* 99, n. 1 (250, 9: 264; but Origen is not named). H. Cornelis, O.P., *RSPT*, 1959, 59: "Origen's thought is quite clear, and Jerome's indignation is, to say the least, exaggerated."

143. Cf. J. Brochet, *S. Jérôme et ses ennemis* (1906), 230, concerning the books attacking Rufinus. M. P. Courcelle, on the other hand, speaks of "spiteful attacks": "Paulin de Nole et S. Jérôme," *REL* 25 (1947), 279.

144. Augustine, *Ep.* 82, c. 3, n. 23: "I read that Origen and Didymus were censured by you in your recent little works, and this was not done moderately or in reference to insignificant questions, although you did commend him marvelously before that" (PL 33: 286).

145. *In Tit.*, 3, 9 (735).

146. "ut pene discipulus esse videatur," to Elias of Aquileia, c. 586 (MGH, *Gr. Reg.*, 2, 466). Cf. F. Cavallera, *S. Jérôme*, 2, 116: "right to the time when the controversy broke out, he put no damper on his praises, even from a dogmatic point of view."

147. Sulpicius Severus, *Dial.*, Bk. 1, c. 7: "I was quite deeply affected by what Jerome thought, for he was a most Catholic man, one most expert in sacred law, who was a follower of Origen at first. But now this very same Jerome condemned all of Origen's distinguished writings. And I have not dared to make a rash judgment about anyone." (1, 68). Cf. Bk. 1, c. 21 (174).

148. "Ego miror unum eumdemque hominem tam divisum a se esse potuisse, ut in ea parte qua probatur, neminem post Apostolos habeat aequalem, in ea vero quae jure reprehenditur, nemo deformius doceatur errasse." *Ibid.*, c. 6 (67-8).

149. H. Leclercq, *S. Jérôme*, 71.

150. *Mémoires* . . . , 12, 2.

151. "Quod si Judas zelotes opposuerit nobis errores ejus, audiat libere:
Interdum magnus dormitat Homerus,
Verum opere in longe fas est obrepere sommum." *Ep.* 84, c. 8 (4, 135).

152. "talis tantusque vir," *Ep.* 34, c. 1 (2, 44); c. 3 and 5: Hilary was sometimes

mistaken in commenting on the psalms, because here and there he followed the opinion of Heliodorus, instead of finding out what Origen had said on the matter (46-8).

153. "non propter dogmatum veritatem, non propter haeresim, ut nunc adversum eum rabidi canes stimulant, sed quia gloriam eloquentiae ejus et scientiae ferre non poterant, et illo dicente omnes muti putabantur." *Ep.* 33, c. 5 (2, 43-4).

154. Cf. Jerome, *Q. hebr. in Gen. praef.*: "For always in public life intrepid courage has its rivals. . . . Concerning Adamantius, whose name, if one may compare the great with the small, is more envied than my name . . . I say this one thing only, that I should like to have, together with the enviable popularity of his name, a knowledge of Scripture, putting no more value on the likenesses and shades of phantoms than I would a wisp of straw, for it is said to be the nature of these phantoms to instill terror in little children and to prattle in dark, gloomy corners" (PL 23: 938 AB); *In Is.*, Bk. 11: "If such great and learned men (Origen, etc.) displease scornful readers, what would they do with me, who with the slightness of my little fund of genius stand vulnerable to the biting attacks of the envious" (24: 377 C).

155. ". . . In priscorum questibus haec plerumque legimus, et insignes didascalos, de suorum insultationibus aemulorum plangentes, plangimus. Hieronymum et Origenem, aliosque doctores, de cavillationibus oblatratorum in allegationibus suis conquestos cernimus . . ." *H. eccl.*, Bk. 6, c. 1 (PL 188: 450 B). A similar malice can already be seen in Gennadius's observation about Rufinus, in *De script. eccl.*, c. 17 (58: 1070-1).

156. Saint Columban, *Ep.* 2, n. 5 (G. S. M. Walker, 14); John the Deacon, *V. Greg.*, preface and Bk. 4, n. 70 (PL 75: 62 D, 222 A); Autpert, *In Ap.* (404 B); Rabanus, *In Matt.* (MGH, *Ep.* 5, 389); cf. hom. 61 de fest. (110: 114-7); Paschasius (120: 1266 A); Helperic of Saint Gall, *L. de computo* (137: 18 B); Eric of Auxerre, *V. S. Germani* (MGH, *Poet.*, 3, 437); Hugh of Fleury, *H. eccl.* (PL 161: 821-2); Rupert, *In Matt.* (168: 1307-8); Honorius, *De imag. mundi* (172: 119-20); John of Salisbury, *Polycr.*, Bk. 7, c. 24 (199: 702 A); Alan of Lille, *Anticl., in fine* (Bossuat, 197-8); Al. Neckam, *De nat. rer.*, Bk. 2, c. 189 (336-43); etc. Cf. Chapter 4.5, n. 65-68.

157. Justinian to Vigilius (553).

158. *De eccl. dogm.*, c. 2, 4, 6, 9, 14 (PL 58: 981-4); "Origen fabricates . . . he raves. . . ," wrote Gennadius to Marseilles, c. 480. He was reckoned, says Ebert (1, 478), in the ranks of "stern orthodox figures."

159. Ed. E. von Dobschütz (1912), 10.

160. "Quid in haeresiarchis Origene deterius?" *Loc. cit.*

161. A. d'Alès, "Origénisme," *DAFC* 3, 1239: "The difference that is posited, apparently, by the Council (of 553), between the person of Origen and that of his disciples would be obliterated in the seventh century. It no longer exists for Saint Sophronius of Jerusalem (634), for the Emperor Heraclius and others. The Lateran Council, in 649, blotted out all the nuances."

162. *Lib. diurnus Pontif. romanorum* (PL 105: 49 B; ed. Th. Sickel, 1899). Formula that has been attested to for the first half of the eighth century: "In this regard, Origen, as well as his impious disciples and followers Didymus and Evagrius, who used pagan fables to attack God, the creator of all things, and the whole of his rational creation, are submitted to eternal condemnation."

163. *Ep.* 90, to Michael, emperor of the Greeks: "What is more, did the Fifth Synod strike (smite) Origen and Theodorus with an anathema when they were already dead,

3. Was an Ethiopian at that time considered a type of viciousness and brutality? Things would have changed a fair bit since Homer, who calls the Ethiopians "impeccable" (*Iliad* 1: 423). Origen, in *In Jer.*, h. 11, n. 5 (85, or h. 7: PL 25: 642 A), makes an allusion merely to the blackness of their skin: "We have a soul that is like the Ethiopians. We wash so as to become gleaming white." Cf. Jeremiah 13:23. However, in *On Prayer*, c. 27, n. 12, we find: "The one who shares in the dragon is none other than the intelligible Ethiopian, etc." concerning Psalm 74:13-14 (370-1). It is likely that in the fourth century they had a bad reputation. Jerome, *Excerpta de psalt.*, prologue: "whom he calls an Ethiopian on account of his cruel and revolting behavior" (*An. mar.*, 3, 1, 18). Later, in his *In Os.*, c. 8, Cyril of Alexandria would say: "It is quite right that those who have an inner mind that is upright and that has had an experience of the light can be understood and said by us and by God to be Ethiopians" (PG 71: 203 D). But this may only be a "spiritual" transposition in the manner of Origen. In his *Polycr.*, Bk. 7, c. 10, John of Salisbury would maintain that the Scriptures have been propagated so far and wide, "that not even the Ethiopians are lacking them at all" (PL 199: 660 D).

4. Here Epiphanius is hesitant: "it is said that he did not make the offering altogether of his own accord"; according to what is said, pagans shook his hand . . . (PG 41: 1071 A).

5. *Panarion*, Bk. 2, vol. 1, her. 64, c. 1-5 (PG 41: 1061-80). Cf. *Praedestinatus*, Bk. 1, her. 42-3 (PL 53: 599-600).

6. Already during the first episode, the persecutors were anxious to make him fall "on account of his exceptional holiness and learning" (1071 A).

7. "Ego nunc nihil pro Origene ago, nec apologeticum pro ipso scribo; sive enim stat apud Deum, sive lapsus est, ipse viderit; suo Domino stat aut cadit." *Apol.*, Bk. 1, n. 10 (PL 21: 548 A). Cf. Romans 14.

8. "cum aliquamdiu sanae fidei forent habiti, ad extremum tamen aut in alienam decidissent sectam, aut ipsi suam haeresim condidissent." *Common.*, c. 17, n. 23 (Rauschen, 38).

9. "Hic idem Origenes, tantus ac talis, dum gratia Dei insolentius abutitur, dum ingenio suo nimium indulget sibique satis credit, dum parvi pendit antiquam christianae religionis simplicitatem, dum se plus cunctis sapere praesumit, dum ecclesiasticas traditiones et veterum magisteria contemnens, quaedam Scripturarum capitula novo more interpretatur, meruit ut de se quoque Ecclesiae Dei diceretur: 'Si surrexerit in medio tui propheta . . . , non audies, inquit, verba prophetae illius.' " *Common., ibid.* (41). In his edition (Cambridge, 1915), R. St. Moxon observes that, quite to the contrary, Origen had a very great esteem for tradition: *Contra Celsum*, Bk. 1, c. 7; Bk. 6, c. 6; *De princ. praef.*, c. 2, etc. The *Dialektos* can now be added (J. Schérer). Thus, Vincent goes on to say, the Church risked being transported "with suddenness from the old religion into a newfangled desecration" *(ibid.)*.

10. *In Matt.*, vol. 12, n. 23: "all who have fallen away from the dogmas of God, the words of the Church, and all wise knowledge of the truth, and are inspired by Basil, for example, or Valentinus, or Marcion or any one of those who teach human things as if they were divine" (122); etc.

11. "Sed et Tertulliani quoque eadum ratio est."

12. "His igitur tot ac tantis, caeterisque hujusmodi ecclesiasticorum exemplorum molibus . . . intelligere debemus, etc." C. 18, n. 24 (R., 42, 43).

13. Nor are there any in the "Notae uberiores" of Barth. Petr. Lintrensis (Douai,

after they were found, in their damnable writings, not to have been properly wise and judicious?"

164. Fr. Diekamp, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten in VI^ten Jahrhundert und der Vte allgemeine Concil* (Münster i. W. [1899]); D'Alès, *loc. cit.*, 1238-9. Deservedly in the *Hist. de l'Eglise* by Fliche-Martin, vol. 4 (1947). L. Bréhier, who recounts the history of the Council, says nothing of Origen. Only a note on p. 472 refers us to Diekamp. (Cf. Duchesne, *op. cit.*, 211). On the synod of 543, *ibid.*, 458-60.

165. Bardy, *DBS*, 2, 579-90. Cf. the *Chronicon* of Idacius, c. 21 (PL 51: 877 D).

166. This is the case for the Son who does not "see" the Father: *Apol.*, Bk. 1, n. 18 (PL 21: 555-6). Origen discarded the term "see," which signified sense perception, in order to adopt the term "know," which was that of Jesus. Cf. *In Jo.*, 19, 6, 35 (305).

167. *Prima*, q. 34, a. 1, ad 1m: "The Arians, of whom Origen is found to be the wellspring" (according to Epiphanius, *Haer.* 64); cf. q. 32, a. 1. In the commentary on Saint John, "Saint Thomas cites Origen 76 times, sometimes with approval, most often, however, in harsh judgment": Spicq, *Esquisse*, 229. "Origen went astray in a bad way," "furthermore, this is heretical and blasphemous," "as Origen said in his raving madness," etc. These were the accepted terms from the time of Epiphanius, Jerome, and Theophilus, the author of *In Isaiam*, 6.

168. "Sanctorum concilium Origenem dudum ejusque sequaces anathematis fulmine percussit." Autpert, *In Ap.*, Bk. 10 (644 H).

169. "Origeniani"

170. Isidore, *Etym.*, Bk. 8, c. 5, n. 40, account of the "Origenians" (using Jerome and Augustine) (PL 82: 301 C). However, in the list of 64 heresies which constitute Isidore's *De haeresibus*, published in 1940 by P. A. C. Vega, there is no mention of the Origenians. Cf. Honorius, *L. de haeres.* (172: 238 A).

171. Cf. the recent reflections of Henry Chadwick, in "Origen, Celsus, and the Resurrection of the Body," *HTR* 41 (1948), 102: "The critical examination of the evidence should warn us to be on our guard against blindly following Justinian, as is done by Koetschau and de Faye. No doubt it is true that Justinian can be justified in so far as Neoplatonism had penetrated the monasteries under the cover of Origen's name. But if we are dealing with Justinian as an authority for the actual doctrine of Origen himself, difficulties immediately arise . . . ." Bardy, *Recherches*.

Notes to Chapter Four
§3. The Legend of the Fall

1. *S. Jérôme*, p. 120. For Epiphanius Origen is an arrogant man, swollen with pride. He filled the world with his foolish babbling. His ideas are absurd, his teaching is pernicious. His faith is corrupted by pagan superstition. He let himself be bitten by that frightful viper, while he himself became a venomous serpent: *Haer.* 64 (PG 41: 1081 D, 1177 A, 1197-1200); Otto of Freising, *Chron.*, Bk. 4: "Epiphanius . . . a very holy man . . . but brought up in a wilderness, as it were, and rather simple-minded, etc." (ed. *in us. schol.*, 208-9).

2. *Mémoires*, 5, 162. Cf. Basnage, *H. de l'Egl.* 1 (1699), 66: "As he had furious hatred for him, it cannot be doubted that he was too ready to believe this account. . . . Saint Jerome and Saint Augustine were more scrupulous than he was."

1611). In the notes "drawn from the commentary of J. Filesac, doctor of theology in the house of Sorbonne" that he attaches to his translation (1656), I. Baudouin says only that Origen was criticized with very good reason by the ancient Fathers, "principally by Saint Jerome . . . , by Tertullian (!) . . . , by Saint Augustine . . . and by Saint Zeno" (172)! Nor are there any in the annotations of Eug. Klüpfel (1819). R. M. J. Poriel, *De utroque Commonitorio Lirinensi* (1895), contents himself with exclaiming: "How strong and vehement is his style in his fight against the Arians! How fitting it is that someone who has a passionate mind himself should bewail the sad fall of Origen and Tertullian!" It is probably to the influence of Vincent that one must attribute a remark by A. Ebert (1, 478) on "a certain subjective tolerance" that was entertained by Gennadius "toward heretics . . . such as Origen and Pelagius."

14. *Lérins au V^e siècle*, P. Goux (1856), 111-2 and 116.

15. "El Concepto de la Tradición en S. Vincente de L." (*Anal. greg.* 5 [1933], 86).

16. *Patrist. et m. âge*, 2, 252.

17. *Poetry and Letters in Early Christian Gaul* (1955), 189. Möhler, with full knowledge of the facts, cites only the eulogistic part from Vincent's chapter on Origen: *Patrologie* (1840), 569.

18. P. Courcelle, 218-9.

19. "In Tertulliano laudamus ingenium, sed damnamus haeresim; in Origene miramur scientiam Scripturarum et tamen dogmatum non recipimus falsitatem." *Apol. c. libros Ruf.*, Bk. 3, c. 27 (PL 23: 477 B). Cf. *Ep.* 62, c. 2 (3, 116).

20. "nam sicut ille apud Graecos, ita hic apud Latinos nostrorum omnium facile princeps judicandus est." *Common.*, c. 18, c. 24 (R., 43). Vincent knew Greek: J. Madoz, "Cultura humanistica de S. V. de L.," *RSR*, 39, 468-71.

21. If the Middle Ages barely cited Vincent (Labriolle, 650), at least it made more than one allusion to this passage.

22. John Moschus, *The Spiritual Meadow* (French translation by M. J. Rouët de Jounel, *SC*, 12, 66); "and the apparition said to him: This place has been prepared for heretics, for those who blaspheme the holy Mother of God, and for those who follow their doctrines" (*De vitis Patrum pratum spiritale*, Bk. 10, c. 26; PL 74: 131). The story is recalled again by the editor of Peter the Venerable's *Liber miraculorum* (Douai, 1595), fol. 160 b); it had appeared previously in a collection of Dominican miracles: G. S. Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion* (1923), 69.

23. Pelagius II to Elias of Aquileia (c. 586): "And who is unaware of the high praise with which Eusebius extols Origen in his books? But because Holy Church weighs the hearts of her faithful more benignly than she does their words, which she weighs more severely, and she takes into greater account what heretics mean in their own proper writings than what the testimony of Eusebius could absolve them of, Eusebius's mistake in having praised Origen did not, in turn, result in his condemnation" (MGH, *Greg. Reg.*, 2, 466); Aimo, *H. sacrae Ep.*, Bk. 6, c. 2: "To some extent, certain men of the Church had branded Eusebius, because he had been excessive in his praise of Origen" (PL 118: 848 CD).

24. *De numeris. Das Decretum Gelasianum* (E. v. Dobschütz), 10 and 71.

25. "Quanto enim excellentioribus quisque donatur donis, tanto magis pulsatur vitio elationis." Cf. Othloh, *De tentat. suis*, 1 (PL 146: 49 D).

26. "scrutator principiorum." In Saint Leo, *Ep.* 25, c. 1 (PL 54: 741 A).

27. "de Ecclesia pulsus," *De script. eccl.*, c. 33: "Theophilus, a bishop of the city of

Alexandria, wrote one large book against Origen, in which he condemns both him and almost all his writings. At the same time he taught that it was not he in the first place, but rather the ancient Fathers and Heraclas, in particular, who had banished him from the priesthood, expelled him from the Church, and driven him in flight from the city" (PL 58: 1077 B).

28. *Sup. Parab. Sal.*, Bk. 1, c. 7: "And some of the strongest of men have been destroyed by it. As Solomon himself, the wisest of men, and Samson, the strongest, and David, the gentlest, were done in by the snares of women, so was Origen done in by heretical doctrine. Whoever would deny that, after the Apostles, he was a master of the Church, as long as his thinking was right, is in error" (PL 91: 964 AB).

29. "Tam doctus quondam vir, quem Eusebius Cesariensis universarum, quamdiu recte sapuit, ecclesiarum fuisse magistrum confirmat." MGH, *Ep.* 5, 357.

30. *In Ap.*: "There were many who were said to be pillars of the Church. But on account of the slightness of their fund of doctrine, they left the Church, as did Origen and many others" (PL 17: 790 A).

31. "schismaticus," *Did.*, Bk. 4, c. 14: The Chronicle of Eusebius can be read, although in his *Ecclesiastical History* "he wrote one book praising and excusing Origen the schismatic" (PL 176: 787 B).

32. *In 1 Cor.*: "This is the difference between heresy and schism: he who errs in matters of faith is properly called a heretic, while a schismatic is one who errs in terms of brotherly love. For this reason, some say that Origen is not a heretic, but a schismatic, because he did not err in matters of faith, but in certain disputes about Holy Scripture. For it is a fact that he understood certain sentences of it far differently from the way the Catholic Church understood them" (PL 134: 295 AB). On the heretic, cf. Het. and B., *Ad Elip.*, Bk. 1, c. 63 (96: 931 D). For Gennadius, one becomes a heretic only "as the result of a dispute" (58: 983 B).

33. It is for this reason that, even in the opinion of the most moderate, the testimony of history ends up being rejected for the benefit of later, calumnious inventions. Cf. the unbelievable observation on the part of Bellarmine, in *De script. eccl.* (1658 edition, pp. 73-4), according to which it would seem that Eusebius strove to defend or excuse Origen, against the testimony of Epiphanius, of Jerome, and even of the *Spiritual Field*. Bellarmine says nothing, moreover, about the "fall."

34. "Ad haeresim declinavit," *Rat. div. off.*, c. 62 (PL 202: 69 C).

35. "Qui praesumpsit Origenes, protinus defecit in via." *Sup. 4 ev.* (Buonaiuti, 73).

36. *Ep.* 23: "either to purge the fault itself by means of the virtues, as did Cyprian the martyr . . . , or to persist in infidelity, as did Origen" (PL 203: 171 D).

37. "We do not reject reason, but we prefer authority. We do not condemn reason, but we bring it into the customary service of authority. It would have been more healthy for Origen, Osius, and Bonosus to follow authority, by which faith is kept whole and salvation certain, than to follow reason and suffer the shipwreck of their faith and salvation" (*L. de lite*, 3, 14).

38. In Jerome, *Ep.* 91: "I hear that even in the West certain men have suffered shipwreck, for they are not content with their own perdition, but want many to have a share in their death"; and it is very much a question of total shipwreck, in the "flame of Gehenna" (4, 147).

39. "De luminaribus Ecclesiae"

40. "Flores" or "Excerptiones Patrum"

41. The same allusion to the situation of Susanna can be found in the *De vita vere contemplativa*, Bk. 2 (PL 170: 625 B). It came from Origen.

42. "cum omni amore"

43. "Origenes Adamantius altiora ac majora cogitans, propriumque ingenium non sufficiens, aliud per aliud subjectit; et, cum haec nimio mentis ardore cogitasset, oneribus majoribus carricabat se; et cum sic incedere non potuisset, ruina magna illuc devolutus est, et ruina ejus par fuit doctrinae; et quae per aliquas seductiones ineptas multos de via recta in aliam viam perduxit, et venenum ejus quasi tinnulis vocibus Syrenarum, quae canticis pluribus nocere potuit: melior omnibus in bonis, pejor in malis. Alia enim hujus dogmata pulchra et utilia, alia vero secus viam seminata sunt; multi tamen ejus pessimi discipuli multa venenosa sub nomine hujus edidisse videntur." *Excerp. Patrum* (PL 94: 552 AB and CD).

44. "ruina magna devolutus"

45. Here there is inserted a eulogy of Origen, inspired by Jerome. But in this eulogy the words that are cited from Jerome are taken in the wrong way: "but when, after many useful and excellent treatises, which he had produced for the honor and glory of the Holy Church, he came at last to explicate the Song of Songs, he claimed that the Father is not seen by the Son, and that the Son is not seen by the Spirit. Blessed Jerome indicates this in his letters and deeply bewails the downfall of so great a doctor: he says that when Origen had vanquished all the other thinkers in other matters, he vanquished himself in the Song of Songs."

46. Here Manegold gives an example: "as when, for example, in dealing with the resurrection, he positively denied the solidity and truth of risen bodies."

47. "Cujus philosophicae muscipulae laqueum Origenes, magnus vir in Ecclesia, et divinorum eloquiorum mirabilis tractator, tremendo Dei judicio evadere non metuit. . . . Cujus laudabile ingenium quamdiu caritate duce incaluit, et ab apostolicae doctrinae lumine non recessit, per directum gradiens, altitudinem spiritualem intellectus salubriter aliis ministravit; ubi vero profunditatem sapientiae et scientiae Dei incomprehensibilem . . . profanis Graecorum dogmatibus . . . commiscere tentavit, miseranda humanae fragilitatis sorte, vir egregius et sublimis considerationis, quasi de altissima specula lapsus, gravissime corruit, exemplumque posteris factus est, cum quanta reverentia et timore divini consilii celsitudo et profunditas mysteriorum Dei attingenda sit, et ut quisque de se sciat quia quanto velocior est animae suae motus, tanto paratior illi casus est, nisi cum cautela et caelesti praesidio moveatur." *C. Wolfehmun colon.*, c. 6, "Concerning their [the philosophers'] unsound confession and the fall of Origen, who drew excessively on their teachings" (*L. de lite*, 1, 306; PL 155: 155-6).

48. "Quamdiu. . . . Ubi vero. . . ."

49. "recessit," "defecit," "corruit," or "casus," "lapsus," "ruina," "naufragium"

50. "damnatio"

51. Chronicle, years 359, 365, 368, 375 (MGH, *Chr. min.*, 3, 290-2).

52. *Aetas sexta* (PL 123: 85-7).

53. *Chronicon* (MGH, *Scr.*, 1, 545); with a fantastic chronology: from the year 176 Origen "was considered famous throughout the whole world," dying in 206.

54. PL 154: 467-9 and 690 C, 694 C.

55. *Chronicon*, years 209, 230, 232, 242, 249, 253 (PL 143: 68-72).

56. *De imag. mundi*, Bk. 3 (PL 172: 181 C); *De script. eccl.*, Bk. 1, c. 55, according to Jerome (203-4).

57. *Abbreviationes Chronicorum*, 69.

58. "Alexandria, *imo toto orbe* clarus habetur."

59. "tanta adversus eum debacchatus insania . . ."

60. "Ferunt de eo quidam . . . ," *Chronicon*, vol. 2, Bk. 3, c. 2-8 (PL 106: 1175-82).

61. "Plurimum admirari non sufficio, quod vir tam illustris, tam aperte rebellans et obvians haereticis, devolutus sit in notissimam haeresim!"

62. "devolutio," *H. sacrae Ep., sive De christ. rer. memoria*, Bk. 6, c. 3 (PL 118: 850 B). In this way, Aimo takes up Sulpicius Severus's impulse of sceptical astonishment, even as he reinforces the more precisely detailed grounds for it (see above, Chapter 4.2, n. 147).

63. "Ubi bene scripsit, nemo melius."

64. "valde compatiendum est tam eruditi pectoris viro, qui tantam nobis eruditionis copiam ministravit; cujus vitia, si qua sunt in scriptis, potest eorum quae fideliter scripsit luminosus quidam ac caelestis splendor exsuperare."

65. "Quod autem erratum est ab Origene, et contra orthodoxam fidem aliquid descriptum, opinor hoc ei accidisse, quia nimio lectionis studio philosophos est amplexus. Attigerat enim et omnino assecutus fuerat secreta Platonis, et Pythagorae, Zenonisque stoici, et Cerinthi volumina, caeterorumque philosophorum; et fortasse, quia nimis est immoratus, et diutius ebibit de calice Babylonis inaurato, quodammodo coactus est de ejus faece in sacram Scripturam aliquid effundere. — Ex quo valde et vigilanter cavendum est, ecclesiasticis viris, ne nimis philosophicis institutis dent operam, ne forte, cum inebriati fuerint, inanibus poculis, et tumidis assertionibus inflati, difficilius, retracto pede, ad humilitatem Christi revocentur." *Loc. cit.* (850-1). The Anglican William Cave ends his observations about Origen by citing Aimo, Bk. 6, c. 3: *H. litt. des écrivains eccl.*, new edition (1741), 1, 115-6.

66. Cf. Manitius, 3, 376-88; Kassian Haid, *Otto von Freising* (1934), excerpt from *Cist. Chronik*, 44-5 (1933); P. Brezzi, "Ottone di Frisinga," *Bullet. dell'Int. storico Ital. per il Medio Evo (Archivio Murator.)* 54 (1939, 129-328); Robert Folz, *Le souvenir et la légende de Charlemagne dans l'empire germanique médiéval* (1950), 186-91; Josef Koch, "Di Grundlagen der Geschichtsphilosophie Ottos . . ." (*Festgabe f. F. X. Sippelt*, 1953, 79-94); *ASOC*, 14 (1958), 151-346.

67. In his *Gesta Friderici*, Bk. 1, c. 57, where he deals with Bernard criticizing Gilbert de la Porrée, he recalls the case of Epiphanius attacking Chrysostom (MGH, *Scr.*, 20, 384).

68. "ut quidam asserunt . . . ," *Chronicon*, Bk. 3, c. 27: "This is Origen, who . . . wrote many useful things about the divine Scriptures. But in his excessive trust in human power and his imprudent reliance on worldly reasoning, he spread perplexity over every facet of his religious labors, mixing up errors with well-spoken teachings, as some claim. For this reason, you understand that, in his case, when he was good, there was no one better, but when he was bad, there was no one worse" (MGH, *Scr.*, 20, 187).

69. C. 31 and 35 (188).

70. There is perhaps a third tradition. Isidore seems quite aware of the legend of the fall. But he transposes it, supposing it to be a fall in opinion, through the effects of calumny:

> "I am that man Origen, once the truest of doctors. . . .

I was high in merit and renowned for the overflowing abundance of my discourse.
Broken suddenly by noxious tongues, I fell to ruin. . . .
No one ever attributed blasphemy to my explanations. . . ."

71. On this translation: Maurice Villain, "Rufin d'Aquilée et l'Histoire ecclés," *RSR* 33 (1946), 164-210. Concerning Origen, some minor details are added by Rufinus to Eusebius's text. These are surveyed by J. E. L. Oulton, "Rufin's Translation of the Church History of Eusebius," *JTS* 30 (1929).

72. "quadriga maledicorum," *H. Eccl.*, Bk. 6, c. 13 (PG 67: 702-3).

73. *Graec. aff. cur.*, Bk. 6 (PG 83: 977 B); *Haer. fab.* (345 D, 349 C, 377 A, 389 A, 393 B, 401 C). In *Q. in Gen.*, c. 1, 20, he cites him at length in order to explain the anthropomorphisms (80: 113-7).

74. In turn he praises Didymus, Theophilus, Chrysostom, and Theodore of Mopsuestia: *H. eccl.*, Bk. 4, c. 26 (PG 82: 1189-92); Bk. 5, c. 22, 28, 39 (1245-8, 1256-7, 1277 AB). He makes Eusebius refute Arius: Bk. 1, c. 12 (848). Taking Chrysostom's part, he passes over the names of Epiphanius and Theophilus in silence (Bk. 5, c. 34): "I do not know what I am experiencing as I come to this part of my account, for as I undertake to recount the wrongs that were done to John, I revere, on the other hand, the virtues which were possessed by his persecutors" (1261-4; 1261 C).

75. Thus Sozomene, *H. eccl.*, Bk. 1, c. 1 (PG 67: 859 AB). Theodoret, *H. eccl.*, pref. (82: 882 B). On the respective worth of these three historians: G. Bidez, *La tradition manuscrite de Sozomène et la Tripartite de Théodore le Lecteur*, TU, 32, 2 b (1908).

76. From 323 to 395 (PL 21: 463-540).

77. About 535. Cf. W. von Christs, *Gesch. der griech. Liter.*, 2 (1924), 1483.

78. R. Hanslik, *Cassiodori Epiphanii Hist. eccl. trip.* (CSEL, 1952), xi-xv.

79. Bk. 6, c. 20 (PL 49: 1041-2); Bk. 10, c. 10-13 (1173-5); Bk. 7, c. 2 (1065-6). Cf. *De div. lect.*, c. 17 (70, 1133-4).

80. PL 68: 939 C.

81. Gregory, *Ep.* 7, 1, *Ep.* 31 (p. 479). Nicholas I (MGH, *Ep.* 6, 4, 481). Cf. Courcelle, 381.

82. *Loc. cit.* (in 597). Cf. *H. Trip.*, Bk. 10, c. 34 (PL 69: 1187 BC).

83. Cf. Gozpertus, Abbot of Tegernsee: "We have two written parts of the Tripartite History. Thus the third part is missing, because we cannot obtain a copy anywhere else, unless, in your kindness, you should deign to send us one" (*Lettres de Teg., Ep.* 41: MGH, *Ep. sel.*, 3, 1925, 47).

84. Jonas, *De cultu imag.*, Bk. 1: "Seeing that it is in agreement with the authority of the *Tripartite History*, we recognize . . ." (PL 106: 311 A); Aeneas of Paris, *L. adv. Graecos*, pref. (121: 687 B).

85. Thus George Syncellus, *Chronographia:* "Origen, who was given over to the consideration of foolish things and vainly desirous of Greek opinions, was intent on novelties in Alexandria. Let Eusebius Pamphili, who was in agreement with his opinions and who lauded him everywhere with the highest of praise, be struck with one and the same judgment" (Paris, 1652, p. 355). The work goes from Adam right to Diocletian.

86. *Chronographia*, year 545: "In this year the fifth holy, ecumenical council . . . was proclaimed against the madman Origen" (PG 108: 502 BC).

87. *Chronographia*, 364-5; 377: when he died, "he added the death of his soul to his impious dogmas."

88. *Hist. ecclesiastica ex Nicephero patr., Georgio Syncello et Theophane contracta*, preface (PG 108: 1189-90). The work is dedicated to John the Deacon (PL 129: 557-61), the biographer of Saint Gregory. On John the Deacon: A. Lapôtre, *Mél. d'arch. et d'hist.*, 21, 317-23; Manitius, 1, 689-95.

89. "a choro sanctorum expulsus"

90. PG 108: 1199-1200; 1201 AC. Cf. W. Jacob, R. Hanslik (1952), xvi.

91. See above, Chapter 4.2, n. 8. This superior man was a ruffian. He was a man who had been excommunicated several times, reduced to the lay state, and driven from Rome, in revolt against Benedict IV, whose tiara he sought to take. He was also the instigator of a double murder in the family of Hadrian II. Even so, each time he found his way back to a measure of good fortune. He became or became once again a chancellor, librarian, and intimate counsellor of popes. In their name he edited the most important letters, sometimes even without showing these letters to them. . . . Besides this, he was the leader of an intransigent party. Not knowing this, Dom Ceillier could not believe that we are dealing with the same Anastasius: vol. 19 (1754), 414-5.

92. We owe this information on the fate of the work of Anastasius to the obligingness of Dom Paul Meyvaert of Quarr Abbey. It is really difficult to understand the following lines by R. Hanslik, the editor of *Historia tripertita:* "In the ninth century, John the Deacon, although he had it in mind to write a history, seems to have been deterred by the magnitude of the labor. . . . Thus, when it was the Tripartite History alone that was extant and it was the means by which one could learn about the deeds that had been done, it assumed a more and more prominent place in the estimation of men" (viii). However, the *Chronographia* of Anastasius did exist.

93. In France, right to the thirteenth century, E. Lesne notes, in *op. cit.*, that only five libraries possessed it: Laon, Beauvais, Massay near Bourges, Cluny, and Limoges. It may be that England did not have a single one.

94. *Hist. eccles.*, prologue to the sixth book: "That book, however, remained hidden for many years, but after that, by the grace of God, it came into my hands" (PL 163: 837 D; MGH, *Scr.* 10, 357). If the copy that he had in hand really came from Italy (Manitius, 1, 685), it is not impossible for it to have come from Monte Cassino, for there were connections between Fleury and Monte Cassino at the time of Abbot Oderistus (1086-1105) (D. P. Meyvaert). Formerly Leo of Ostia had perhaps used this manuscript from Monte Cassino.

95. "non est frivola vel inepta, sed authentica, probabilis et robusta"

96. Prologue to the sixth book: "I have culled many of the things that follow from the book of Anastasius Bibliothecarius the Roman, etc." (PL 163: 837 CD; *Scr.*, 10, 257).

97. This Book 6 begins with the year 575. It is not, however, impossible for him to have revised his previous books after his discovery of Anastasius. The brief fragments published in Migne or in the MGH do not allow us to make a judgment about this. One only notices that no allusion is made to Anastasius or to Origen in the preface to Book 2 (354-5). The hypothesis broached by the *HLF* (1868 edition, 10, 299) and taken up by G. Waitz (MGH, *Scr.*, 9, 1925 edition, 338), according to which Hugh, after drafting his History in four books, would have discovered the work of Anastasius and would, as a result, have issued a second edition in six books, appears in my mind to be contradicted by the fact that he speaks of his discovery, not in the general preface to

the edition in six books, but only in the preface to the sixth book. Cf. *HLF*, 299: "The discoveries that he made by reading (Anastasius) . . . probably made him resolve to revise his work and augment it . . ."; and MGH, p. 338: "Not long after (his first draft) Hugh obtained the *Tripartite History* by Anastasius . . . in translation. . . . It was for this reason, especially, that he seems to have been led to prepare a new edition of his work, which was divided into six books."

98. *Eccl. hist.* (Paris, Latin translation, 1562).

99. *Thesaurus orthodoxae fidei*, Bk. 4, against the ante-Arian heresies, 44; heresy 31, the heresy of Origen (PG 139: 1301-13).

100. See above, n. 88 and 90.

101. J. Scaliger had noticed the bias of Syncellus. But his editor, the Dominican Jacques Goar, reproves him for it and cites Anastasius on behalf of his author. In Glotz, *H. du moyen âge*, 3 (1936), Diehl and Marçais adduce George Syncellus and Theophanes as proof of the "powerful burst of intellect" in Byzantium toward the end of the eighth century. They also note that another sign of this period was its "breadth of spirit" and "even its tolerance" (289). For L. Bréhier, Syncellus and the others "reproduced the texts of their predecessors without changing anything in them and were quite content to continue on with them" (*La civilisation byzantine* [1950], 347). Not on every score! Dom Ceillier observed: "If he sometimes copies Eusebius, he draws attention to the errors which he believed that this historian had fallen into" (12, Vivès, 155).

102. Both of them recount at great length the story of the Ethiopian. Nicetas, in particular, follows Epiphanius closely, even though he embellishes him somewhat. He entangles himself in contradictions. Not only does Origen "subvert all of Scripture," but "he trivializes and babbles about some other things besides, which, to my mind, he seems not to write about properly." This did not stop him from being "the doctor who is most acceptable to everyone in the whole discipline of morality." In matters of faith and contemplation "he showed himself to be quite absurd," etc. (1304 C; 1313 A).

103. After he had abjured his faith, says Nicephorus, "then, having fallen from the grace-filled purposes of God, he introduced strange opinions at the instigation of Satan. Since many had been seduced from a healthy state of mind as a result of these opinions, after a space of time he was outlawed by the Church of God through a sentence of excommunication": Bk. 5, c. 32, 135.

104. *Paenitentia Origenis*

105. *Lamentum* or *Planctus*

106. C. 5, n. 6, in the list of apocryphal works: "The book which is called the *Repentance of Origen*" (12 and 54).

107. "Doleo in anima mea, o amici mei! quia de summo cecidi. Cecidi, et confractus sum, et non est in me sanitas. Doleant super me angeli, quia pessime rui . . ." *Planctus seu Lamentum Origenis, translatum a beato Hieronymo presbytero de graeco in latinum:* in the edition of Origen by Josse Bade and Jean Petit (1512), Bk. 2, vol. 4, fol. 158-9. Jacques Merlin, who contributed to this edition, considered the *Planctus* to be authentic.

108. "In my mental pain and affliction I begin to speak to those who notice that my mind is distraught and that my speech is out of the ordinary, as I sit before the judgment seat of Christ and his saints. And how should I speak, restrained and held fast as I am, not daring to move my lips? And my tongue does not render me its obedience. The muscles of my throat are constricted. And all my organs are stained by iniquity. But I shall act. I shall start falling on my knees, and shall beseech all the saints,

so that they may come to my aid, for I do not dare to approach God on account of the enormity of my sin . . . ." The amplification of Epiphanius's phrase about silent tears can be seen here.

109. "Origenes paenitentiam agit," *Ep.* 84, n. 10: "In a letter written to Fabian, the bishop of the city of Rome, Origen himself repents over having written such things" (4, 137). Origen's letter is lost. The editor of Liberatus of Carthage seems to force things somewhat when he says that, according to Jerome, Origen directed a "little book of repentance" to Fabian, "because what he had entrusted to the realm of letters was rightly condemned" (PL 68: 1048 C). Baronius (a. 232, c. 10), on the other hand, would criticize Origen because "he published no commentary by way of retraction."

Notes to Chapter Four
§4. Gradual Precautions

1. "Eloquentissimae nimis homiliae sunt Origenis . . . , quem multorum quidem Patrum sententia designavit haereticum." *De inst. div. litt.*, c. 1 (PL 70: 1111 C).

2. "Quemadmodum legi debeat [Origenes] . . . sanctus Hieronymus probabiliter indicavit, ut nec studiosos ab ejus necessaria lectione removeat, nec iterum incautos praecipitet ad ruinam. Quem quidam non immerito mora anethi habendum esse dixerunt, qui, dum sacrarum condiat pulmentaria litterarum, legendus est, ut sic inde succos saluberrimos assumamus, ne pariter ejus venena perfidiae, vitae nostrae contraria sorbeamus. Cui et illud convenienter aptari potest quod Virgilius dum Ennium legeret, a quodam quid faceret inquisitus, respondit: Aurum in stercore quaero." *Ibid.* (1111-2).

3. *Ep.* 119, n. 11 (PL 22: 979). It is also the text that would be invoked by Saint Boniface in order to make use of profane writings: *Ars grammatica*, pref. (P. Lehmann, *Hist. Vierteljahrschrift* [1931], 755).

4. "praesenti tempore, a Vigilio papa viro beatissimo constat esse damnatum." *Inst.*, c. 1 (PL 70: 1111 CD).

5. *Ibid.*: ". . . who, in the judgment of many of the Fathers, was considered a heretic; Saint Jerome translated some of his smaller works into quite eloquent Latin" (1111 C). It is too early for him to be so bold as to speak, as did Isidore in the following century in faroff Spain, of "impious weapons"!

6. These are doubtless the passages which are found omitted in certain categories of manuscripts: Courcelle, p. 366.

7. *Inst.*, c. 1: "Those who come later say that he is to be shunned entirely, because he has a subtle way of deceiving those who are innocent. But if, with the help of the Lord, precautions are taken, his poisons cannot do any harm" (PL 70: 1112 B).

8. *Vita Verg.*: "When Virgil was preoccupied with Ennius and someone asked him what he was doing, he answered that he was gathering gold from Ennius's dungheap" (31).

9. ". . . Caelestis Rex maledicat talia figmenta. Et quid haec eadem nominare valeo? nisi supra compositorum equorum, qui redam tuam trahunt, stercora decidentia. Unde non immerito Ennius poeta a quodam interrogatus, quid quaereret in Marone, respondit: 'Aurum, inquiens, in stercore quaero.' Et quia, prout nosti, sicut stercus parat agrum ad proferendum satius frumentum, ita dicta paganorum poetarum, licet feda sint, quia

non sunt vera, multa tamen adjuvant ad percipiendum divinum eloquium." C. 25 (MGH, *Ep.* 5, 563).

10. "libri gentilium"

11. *Astronomia,* preface: "Although it is absolutely appropriate for us to be on the lookout for gold in the dungheap when we investigate secular philosophy" (PL 150: 1641 C).

12. *Spec. Eccl., dom. in Septuag.* (PL 172: 855 C).

13. *Polycr.,* Bk. 5, prologue: "For if it was permissible for Virgil to seek the gold of wisdom in the dungheap of Ennius, how is it contemptible for us to communicate what has been written by the pagans for our instruction?" (PL 199: 539 B). In the dialogue on Lancelot in Chapelain's *De la lecture des vieux romans* (1646), one of the interlocutors compares him to a dungheap in which diamonds are to be found. Pauphilet, *Le legs du moyen âge,* 30.

14. *Sup. Ap.,* prologue: "Just as a prudent man ought to attend to a precious gem in a dungheap by gathering it up and restoring it to its natural worth, once it has been found, so, from whatever place truth shines forth, Catholic unity should defend it. . . . For indeed it is quite right that faith has gathered from the faithless what has been recognized as having its own sphere of authority etc." (PL 86: 794 C).

15. "in quibus si quippiam nostrae religionis aptum reperiatur, id ut aurum de luto collectum, velut pretiosissima gemma de stercore ad dominicum thesaurum reportatur." *In Cant.,* Bk. 9 (172).

16. Toward the end of *In Ap.* where the author gives his admonition: "To you, whom God has given a knowledge of literature, and into whose hands this book has fallen as reading material, I make a solemn appeal that you not cast aside the discourses in this book on account of their ill-framed and rustic style. I beg you rather to imitate him who, with sparkling water, washed a gem that he had found in the dungheap for so long that it was restored to its pristine splendor. Therefore I ask you, moreover, to wash away the filth of my ignorance with the water of your wisdom . . ." (PL 17: 1057 AB; edition of 1879).

17. "Yet I admonish the careful reader to make no account of the foul heap of barbarisms in this little work and to apply the eyes of faith to the truth when it is garbed in common speech. And let him read what he finds here with a brisk thoroughness, as if he were looking for a pearl in a dungheap etc." (MGH, *Scr.,* 15, 544).

18. *Ep.* 10, 16, to Innocent, Prefect of Africa: "Since you wished a book explaining Holy Job to be sent to you, we rejoice entirely in your zeal. . . . But, if you have the sense to be put on weight with the finest of food, read the works of Blessed Augustine, your countryman, and do not look for our rough fare of bran to compare with his fine wheaten loaves" (MGH, *Greg. Reg.,* 2, 251-2); 12, 16 a (363).

19. "licet in quibusdam locis scripturarum suarum a fide orbitare videantur." *Adv. Fel.,* pref.: "For it has been shown that even Blessed Paul, the vessel of election and doctor of the gentiles, relied on certain proofs from the books of the pagans, thinking that he had extracted some sure gold from the dungheap. And it has been shown, moreover, that after this gold had been washed he brought it into the Lord's treasury. Following his example, almost all the holy doctors have inserted into their own works many things that they derived from the books of the pagan philosophers and poets" (PL 101: 128 B; C; or MGH, *Ep.* 4, 337; *Ep.* 203, to Charles, in 800).

20. Cf. Jerome to Tranquillus, *Ep.* 62, c. 2: "I am very much of the opinion that one

can read Origen for his erudition, as one reads Tertullian, Novatian, Arnobius, Apollinaris . . ." (3, 116).

21. Alcuin, *ibid.*: "I have made these claims, which are demonstrably consistent with the approved doctors. In so doing, I have followed the examples of the blessed doctor Jerome, who was in the habit of inserting many corroborating examples from Origen into his slighter works, although they are clearly in error in certain respects."

22. *Essai sur S. Jérôme*, 160.

23. *In Ep. Pauli*, preface: "The doctors themselves were all Catholic, except for Origen. In his case, I have only taken up opinions that I feel are compatible with a Catholic outlook" (PL 111: 1276 A).

24. *Praef. in Collect. Ep. et Ev.*: "regarding the sermons and writings of the Fathers . . . even those of Pelagius and Origen, which are to be read with caution" (PL 102: 13 C). Yet Smaragdus gave Tyconius a place among the Fathers.

25. "quanquam caute legendus," Letter to Pacificus (MGH, *Ep.* 5, 357).

26. "salva fide Patrum," "quod etiam orthodoxi quoque et religiosi viri diffiteri non possunt," *H. sacrae epit.*, Bk. 6, c. 2 and 3 (PL 118: 848 D, 850 B).

27. *In Lev.*, c. 7: "The knowledge of heretics and philosophers is often useful to us in many respects. For it often happens that we find the knowledge of Aristotle, Priscian, and Origen necessary" (PL 164: 405 C).

28. "male dicta sunt confutata, et bene dicta servata," in Gerhoh, *De novit. hujus temp.*, c. 24 (*L. de lite*, 3, 303).

29. Bernald, *De excommun. vitandis:* "As regards chapters that even the Fathers accepted, that book says nothing, or if it says anything, it introduces a false note. The ingenuity of the Catholic translator has done us a commendably prudent service in excluding this false note from the Latin text. This is clearly what Jerome often did in his translation of Origen" (*L. de lite*, 2, 124). There is a bit of malice here directed against Jerome.

30. "innumeras et supramodum abominandas haereses," *Intr. ad th.*, Bk. 1, c. 15 (PL 178: 1006 C, 1038-9); *Th. christ.*, Bk. 2 (1170 AB).

31. "Sic et beatum Hilarium et nonnullos sanctos multa ex ipsius Origenis vel aliorum errantium scriptis interseruisse sententiis non ambigimus, opinionem nobis aliorum potius praesentantes quam sententiam proferentes: quod tamen non tam per ipsos nobis quam per alios postmodum innotuit. . . . Ubi quidem, cum nonnulla reperiremus a veritate dissona vel aliorum sanctorum scriptis contraria, Origeni potius quam Hilario sunt imputanda, licet ipse hoc Hilarius non distinguet, quale illud statim, quod primum psalmum de Capite (Christo) non esse intelligendum astruere nititur, sed generaliter de quolibet alio justo esse accipiendum. Quod et ipse Hieronymus, in quadam expositione quorumdam psalmorum, Origenem similiter prosecutus, posuit. Ipsum quoque Origenem, ipso attestante, non ambigendum est nonnulla magnis erroribus implicita juxta opinionem aliorum protulisse" (PL 178: 1342-3). One should not try to read any kind of evolution of thought from one text to another. The *Sic et non* can be dated to 1122-3 and the *Theologia christiana* to 1123-4. The *Introductio* would have been completed in 1125: J. G. Sikes, *Peter Abailard* (1932), app. 1, 258-71; J. R. McCallum, *Abelard's Theology* (1948), 25.

32. "Origenes, cujus scripta nec omnino refutat, nec per omnia recipit Ecclesia," *Did.*, Bk. 4, c. 14 (PL 176: 787 A).

33. "Accipe quod petisti, sed ita ut scias detestanda tibi in eis esse quam plurima." An enumeration of his errors follows. Landgraf, *ZFKT* 79 (1957), 420.

34. "Sunt hic plura sacra, sunt hic mundalia plura;
Ex his qua placent carmina, tolle, lege.
Prata vides plena spinis et copia florum:
Si non vis spinas sumere, sume rosas."

Cf. Beeson, *Isidorstudien* (1913), 135-6. Regarding this library: Fontaine, 735-62.

35. A. Seleucos: "Avoid the thorns, pluck the rose. This should be your sovereign rule of thumb in pursuing secular studies" (PG 37: 1581-2). In William of Hirschau the image would seem a pallid companion piece to the image of the gold to be sought in the dungheap (PL 150: 1641 C).

36. *In Jo.*, tr. 46, n. 6: "pluck the grape, avoid the thorn. The vine has not given rise to the thorn, but runners from the vine have wrapped themselves around the thorns" (CCL, 36, 401).

37. "Multo cautius necesse est acutis rosa in spinis, quam mollibus lilium colligatur in foliis; multo securius in apostolicis quam in platonicis quaeritur consilium salubre pagellis." *In Sam.*, Bk. 2, c. 9 (PL 91: 589-90); "for even the bees themselves, who make honey like this, use their mouths to present what is sweet and gladdens the heart, but they keep their poisoned stingers in the posterior parts of their bodies." Bede's tendency to a certain exclusivism in his ecclesiastical culture can be sensed in this passage.

38. ". . . Qui, dum ab aliquo fuisset interrogatus, quomodo ea quae abdicaverat rursus amplecteretur, ita respondit: Origenis libri similes sunt prato floribus universis pleno; quidquid ergo in eis bonum invenero, hoc decerpo; si quid vero mihi spinosum occurrerit, hoc quasi pungat omitto." *H. trip.*, Bk. 10, c. 14 (PL 69: 1177 A); "Theophilus says this, but he does not consider the words of Solomon, who said, in his great wisdom, that 'the sayings of the wise are like goads' (Ecclesiastes 12: 11)." Cf. Socrates, Bk. 6, c. 17 (PG 67: 715 AB).

39. "Si mihi credere vis, studui tot millia libros
Quot legio missos ducit in arma viros.
Nulla meos unquam tetigit blasphemia sensus,
Sed vigil et prudens tutus ab hoste fui.
Sola mihi casum Periarchon dicta dederunt.
His mihi conjectum non pia tela premunt."

These two poems are to be found in *Irenikon*, 434-5 (Leclercq). The inspiration of Isidore is also evident here.

40. "collatio"

41. "Salvator meus luget etiam nunc peccata mea. Salvator meus laetari non potest donec ego in iniquitate permaneo." *In Lev.*, h. 7, n. 2 (on Leviticus 10:9) (374). The text given by Bernard is somewhat different, but this does not change the meaning. It is interesting to note that Bernard has given to a phrase from Origen/Rufinus the striking aspect of a sentence that might have been written by Bernard himself.

42. "sicut sonare videntur"

43. Cf. Jerome, *In Amos*, 5, 23, on the prayer of the Jews: "a pig-like grunting and a noisy cacophony of asses" (PL 25: 1054 C).

44. "sanctorum Patrum auctoritas"

45. It could be a matter of the literary tradition handed down by Isidore and others having its origin in Jerome's severe judgments. Nevertheless, I think it is more probable that Bernard is thinking of the "Fathers" of the Council, seeing that, in the wake of

Cassiodorus, their judgment came to have an almost obsessive ascendancy over the Latin West whenever Origen was spoken of. In other respects, the two meanings of this word "Fathers" were closely allied, or even overlapping. Cf. Zosimus: "the decrees and statutes of the Fathers" (PL 20: 649 B, 661 B); "the authority of the Fathers and the Apostolic See" (672 A). *Lib. adv. Caelest.*: "as judged by the Apostolic See or by the Fathers" (20: 711 A); Ambrose, *De fide:* "For this reason the Fathers thought that even sacrilegious dogmas should be included in their decrees . . ." (16: 555 C); Innocent I, *Ep.* 29, on conciliar decisions: "the laws of the Fathers" (20: 583); *Conc. arausic.* (529): "the definitions of the early Fathers" (MGH, *Conc.*, 1, 51). *Conc. Valent.* (529): "recommending the ancient laws of the Fathers" (*ibid.*, 59); Cassiodorus, *Inst.*, c. 28: "The holy Fathers have decreed" (70: 1142); "the judgment of many Fathers" (see above, n. 1); Twelfth Council of Toledo (681): "the decrees of the Holy Fathers" (Mansi, 11, 1030 D); Roman Council of 769 — a history of the Council speaks of "the decrees of the Holy Fathers" (MGH, *Conc.*, 2, 78); Alvarus: "condemned by the Fathers" (Madoz, 124); W. Strabo: "the ancient statutes of the Fathers" (114: 949 A); Florus: "as decided by a council of the Holy Fathers" (121, 1129 B); *Capitula Rodulfi:* "the edicts of the Fathers" (119: 709 A); "in the way that was decided by the blessed Fathers" (714 A); Déoduin of Liège: "through the councils of the Holy Fathers" (146: 1440 D). At the time of the Gregorian reform we find an abundance of terms such as the following, even though it was not normal to crowd them together: "the decrees, statutes, opinions, rules, sayings, canonical judgments, ordinances, and sanctions of the Fathers," etc. Cf. Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne*, 1, 36-7; 2, 203. P. Damian (PL 145: 162 C, 265 D, 372 B; 387 D, 484 B).

46. *De div.*, s. 34, *De verbis Or.*, n. 1: "I am afraid that some of you, perhaps, may be harmed by the words that were read to you yesterday from Origen's homily on that chapter of the law, where Aaron and his sons are forbidden to drink wine, as they are about to approach the altar: if they understand these words in their simple, literal aspect, which is the kind of ring they have to them. 'My Savior even now yet bewails my sins, and his sadness remains for as long as we are in error.' There are many other words spoken in this way, more by way of excess, perhaps, than caution and not so much temperately as distinctly. What does that grumbling mean? Who is murmuring among you? I know that those who are learned in divine law laugh at words like this: but all the same I confess that I am even less in debt to the wise. The question does not revolve merely around Origen's understanding. It could have been that he was speaking hyperbolically: that is his own matter, it makes no difference to us. Although I believe that it should not be hushed up that quite clearly the authority of the holy Fathers confirms that he wrote some things against the faith, and therefore there is an admonition that he should be read with caution. At the present time, we are not making an inquiry into what he thought, but we do desire to discuss this so that all of you, having a good sense of what pertains to sound doctrine, may not be provoked by those words in any way" (PL 183: 630-1).

47. "ipse viderit," *Apol.*, Bk. 1, n. 10 (PL 21: 548 A; Rufinus had read it in Origen: see above, Chapter 4.2, n. 126). Bernard proceeds here as did Augustine, who, after having defended Marcellinus and his deacons when they had been accused by the Donatists, concluded: "In no way are we encompassed by their innocence, in no way are we condemned by their iniquity. If they were good, they were cleaned like grain on the threshing floor of Catholicism; if they were bad, they were crushed like stubble

on the threshing floor of Catholicism . . ."; *De unico bapt. c. Petil.*, c. 16, n. 30 (PL 43: 611). It seems, therefore, that neither Genebrard, who defended Origen against Bernard, nor Huet, who agreed with Bernard, had an exact understanding of the abbot of Clairvaux (*Origeniana*, Bk. 1, c. 2, q. 4, n. 29; PG 17:835-7).

48. All the rest of the sermon is devoted to explaining that the Savior can no longer experience sadness in the proper sense of the word and that he cannot weep (any more than can the blessed), but that this happy inability takes nothing away from his goodness or his mercy toward us.

49. Godfrey of Admont, *H. dom.* 46 (PL 174: 315 A); compare this with Bernard, *In f. omn. sanct.*, *s.* 3; *s.* 4, n. 2 (183: 468-73); *De dil. Deo*, n. 29-33 (182: 992-5). Similarly, for the *De myst. Eccl.*, c. 3, the "complete number of the saints" and "perfect joy" were bound to be on an equal footing (177: 346 CD); etc. Cf. Julian of Toledo, *Progn.*, Bk. 2, c. 26-8 (96: 487-91).

50. Bernard de Vregille, "L'attente des saints d'après S. Bernard," *NRT* 70 (1948), 225-44. *Catholicisme*, ch. 4. Cf. Fr. Ribera, *In Ap.* (1593), c. 6 (197-8). For another sermon (*In Cant.*, s. 27, n. 8; PL 183: 917 C), Berenger said to Bernard: "you are committing the same perverse fault as Origen!" *Apol. c. Bern.* (PL 188: 1866 C). Cf. P. Courcelle, *AHDLMA* 24 (1958), 12-13.

51. "libri textus divini"

52. On the opinion that he attributes to Origen of a crucifixion for demons, *In Cant.*, n. 54, n. 3: "this is in contrast with Origen, who resorts to an impudent falsehood, when he argues that the Lord of glory is crucified again in the air for the benefit of the demons" (PL 183: 1039 D). Cf. Theophilus (Jerome, *Ep.* 92), n. 4 (4, 154). He also believes Jerome's complaint regarding his teaching on the Holy Spirit: *De err. Abael.*, c. 1 (182: 1057 B). Another allusion to Origen (and to Gregory), *In Cant.*, *s.* 29, n. 7 (931-2).

53. "Dominus Jesus Christus nondum ascendit in caelum." Helinand, *s.* 21 (PL 212: 658 C).

54. *Mystère de Jésus*

55. Recently again, "Il mistero di Gesù," an anonymous article that appeared in *Testimonianze* 1 (1958), made a connection between the two passages drawn from Origen and Pascal respectively, even while it noted the difference in their Christian sensibilities. Before and after Saint Bernard, there are other names that stake their claim on this tradition. "Tensions of the Resurrection," an article by the Bishop of Salford that appeared in the *Tablet* (5 April 1958), recalls a beautiful passage from Julian of Norwich that evokes the same notion.

56. Leclercq, *Med. St.*, 15, 105.

57. "Nonnumquam tamen ad opera Origenis, et alia consimilia, in quibus interdum cerastes in semita tanquam explorator accedat, et ibi margaritas in lecto, et uvas in labruscis, et rosas inter spineta quaerere discat, ut impleatur quod dictum est: Et si mortiferum quid biberint, non eis nocebit." *Ep. ad amicum suum* (PL 213: 716 D).

58. "Homilia Origenis ab Hieronymo castigata"

59. "Homilia Origenis . . . quae catholice correcta est," twelfth-century manuscript from Tours (Leclercq, *Irenikon*, 427).

60. "propter infamiam haeresis," J. Beleth, *Rat. div. off.*, c. 62 (PL 202: 69 CD). Beleth is merely a simple reporter of these inclinations.

61. "ex quo fit, quod Origenis errorum perversitas, ejus studium in qua parte claruit, nequaquam decoloravit." *In unum ex quatuor*, preface, 3: "In the same way as the sacraments can be partaken of, even by those who are evil, without taking on the taint

of their corruption, sayings or writings, to tell the truth, can also be freed from the grip of heretics by their own proper sense at the very least, etc." (PL 186: 38 D). See above.

62. *C. quatuor labyr.*, Bk. 3, c. 5: "Those who are of the devil's party imitate him, as Rufinus once did, when, together with a considerable number of good things, he published translations of Origen's blasphemies" (Glorieux, 252). Gautier considers Peter Lombard "another Origen." This was the worst insult that he could find (Bk. 4, app., c. 55, 326).

63. *Resp. de damnat. Sal.* (PL 203: 623-66). On Philip: Fr. Petit, *Prémontrés*, 129-66.

64. *Ep.* 6: "But let it be so. Let the books of Origen and any material of that kind be rejected, lest the simple-minded be led into error by having falsehood supplied to them rather than truth. The seduction of a falsehood that is not understood would do its harm, no matter how beneficial the knowledge of any element of truth that has been found could be" (PL 203: 47 A).

65. "librum a manibus abjecit." *Ep.* 23: "The Prior of a certain church in our native country had found an untitled book of Origen's in the library of the church and was reading it eagerly with a favorable disposition, since in certain respects it was an excellent work. One day I found him and pointed out certain errors in the book, so that he would not continue reading it. When I had admonished him, he gladly picked up the book and threw it from his hands" (PL 203: 172 A). In a similar way, Autpert once showed his mistrust of Tyconius (see above, Chapter 2.2).

66. Ermenric, *Ad Grim.*, c. 24: "Then I awoke and made the sign of the cross. I threw his book far away and then laid me down to rest again" (MGH, *Ep.* 5, 561-2).

67. "Quatuor Ecclesiae doctores, laude corusci,
Isidorus, Victorinus, nec non Origenes,
Et plures alii, quod est labor enumerari,
De scripto vetere nisi sunt enucleare
Quas invenerunt tectas sub nube figuras,
Ex quorum pratis studui decerpere flores . . ."

Pitra, 3, 37.

68. "Adamantius ille magnus ac magniloquus et merito famosus." *Gemma ecclesiast. proem.* (J. S. Brewer, 1862, 4). Gerald goes on to allude to: "our Jerome, who imitates him with regard to what is good and in terms of his disciples."

69. *Ep. pasch.*, 17a (Jerome, *Ep.* 98, c. 10): "so as to lift the truth of Scripture from the shadows of allegory and vain imaginings" (5, 46). For a judgment on Theophilus as a critic of Origen: Agostino Favale, SDB, *Teofilo d'Alessandria* (1958), 179-95.

70. "Sicut autem errare probantur Judaei, omnia solum ad litteram intelligentes, eo quod multa litteraliter nequeunt intelligi, sicut sunt plures prophetiae expresse de Christo: sic etiam error Origenis damnatur, quod omnia sic sint spiritualiter accipienda, quod nihil sic veritatis in littera Veteris Testamenti; quia plura ibi facta esse scribuntur, quae etiam in Evangelio confirmantur, ut patet in genealogia Christi et in cujusmodi." *Summa de bono*, Bk. 1, tr. 2, c. 10 (56). Ulrich died around 1278.

71. "se cum Origene errare malle, quam cum aliis vera sentire," *Common*, c. 17 (Rauschen, 37).

72. *Tusc.*, Bk. 1: "I prefer to err in the company of Plato rather than perceive the truth with them."

73. Alluding to the explanation that Origen and Chrysostom had given of the

dispute at Antioch, he had written to Augustine that: "If you reproach me for my error, allow me, I beg you, to err in the company of such as these" (Augustine, *Ep.* 75, c. 3, n. 6; PL 33: 254). On this subject, Augustine (*Ep.* 82, c. 3, n. 23) alludes to the objections that Jerome had elsewhere raised about Origen: "Thus it is that I do not think that even you will allow yourself to err in their company, however much you may say that you would, as if they had not erred in making this judgment. Who is there who would want to be in error, no matter whose company they would be keeping in so doing?" (33: 286).

74. "de summis Ecclesiae proceribus," *Spec. historiale*, Bk. 11, c. 10 (*Sp. majus*, 4 [1624], 416). Ph. of Harvengt, who is so hard on Origen, has a similar, but mitigated, formula, when he says that when it comes to Scripture he prefers not to know anything that the great doctors did not know rather than affirm something that they would have denied: *De damn. Sal.* (PL 203: 666 BC).

75. She had visions beginning in 1152. These visions were famous in her lifetime. In giving an account of them, her brother, Egbert of Schönau, was able to make his own contribution. Toward the end of the century, a new edition of them came out under Roger de Ford: R. J. Dean, "Elizabeth . . . and Roger de Ford," *Modern Philology* 41 (1943-4), 209-20. Cf. K. Koster, "Das visionäre Werk Elizabeth von Schönau," *Archiv mittelrhein. Kirch.* 4 (1952), 79-119.

76. "sed magis ex nimio fervore quo sensum suum immersit profunditatibus Scripturarum sanctarum quas amabat et divinis secretis quae nimis perscrutari volebat." F. W. E. Roth, *Die Visionen der hl. El.* (1884); cited by Leclercq, *Irenikon*, 437. On the subject of Elizabeth (who is often confused with Elizabeth of Hungary): Dom Besse, *Les mystiques bénédictins* (1922), 202-15; Livarius Oliger, "Revelationes b. El.," *Antoninianum* 1 (1926), 24-83. Eus. Amort gives a series of lengthy excerpts from her visions in *De revelationibus . . . privatis regulae tutae* (1750), but this vision does not figure in any of them. Amort had little regard for this saint's visions.

77. Huet (PG 17: 1178 BC). Etienne Binet, S.J., *Du salut d'Origène* (1629), according to the *Liber sanctae Mechtildae*, which had just appeared (1627).

78. Ed. A. Wilmart (1938), Bk. 1, c. 8 (9-15).

79. C. 7 (14):

> "And you, what do you think, Origen, renowned doctor?
> The Father's king would not have reached the stage of death,
> Unless he had first repented with his whole heart."

80. C. 7 (13), the strophe which contains Jerome's reply:

> "This is what Jerome, the doctor, had to say about Ezekiel:
> The king who built the Temple sinned and in straying
> He gave offense, but then he repented, writing the Book of Proverbs,
> Where he acknowledged that he had done penance as was fitting."

81. See above, n. 63 and 64; also Chapter 4.2, n. 72.

82. "Ipse autem salvus erit"

83. Hervaeus, *In 1 Cor.*, c. 2.

84. Evagrius Scholasticus (seventh century), *Hist. eccl.*, Bk. 4, c. 38: "Thus, when the first question was broached, whether the dead could be subjected to an anathema, Eutychius was present there. He was a man who was especially trained in Sacred Scripture, but was not yet very famous, inasmuch as Mennas was still alive. At that

point he was functioning as a legate of the bishop of Amasea. Eutychius looked with a sort of relaxed and lofty contempt on those who had gathered there and said openly that that question did not need consideration, since Josiah the king had not only killed the living priests of the demons, but dug up the graves of those who had been dead for a long while before. And everybody who was present thought that it was most appropriate that Eutychius had said this. Shortly after Justinian had received this advice, he promoted Eutychius to the pontifical see of the royal city, after Mennas had been taken from the land of the living" (PG 86: 2775 AB).

85. "Origenes damnatus est mortuus, qui vivens olim fuerat ante damnatus." C. 23 (PL 68: 1046 C). Cf. Nicephorus (see above, Chapter 4.3), etc.

86. L. Duchesne, *L'Eglise au VI^e siècle* (1925), 174, n. 1.

87. Duchesne, *op. cit.*, 213. Already, however, fault could be found with a formula that appeared in a letter of Pope Anastasius to Simplicianus, n. 2: "And if there are any other things that were explained by Origen, know that they, no less than their author, are condemned by us" (in Jerome, *Ep.* 95: 4, 161). Cf. the *Responsum Synodi* (to Theophilus) in the letters of Jerome, on followers of Origen: "Let them and their dogmas be anathema to the Church" (4, 158). In his second letter on Origen, which was addressed to Venerius, the successor of Simplicianus at Milan, Anastasius went on to say (c. 400-1): "seeing that Origen and his teaching were condemned by everyone." Furthermore, this letter shows that he spoke of this matter without direct knowledge, for he followed the account of Theophilus (J. Van den Gheyn, *RHLR* 4 [1899], 7-8).

88. D. Van den Eynde, *Antonianum* 26 (1951), 237-9.

89. "utrum mortuus possit excommunicari"

90. "Mirum est quod Ecclesia latinorum habet Origenem pro excommunicato, pro quo graecorum Ecclesia solemnizat. Et quaerit sub qua forma sit ferenda sententia in mortuum, aut qua ratione potius in Origenem quam in Augustinum et Hieronymum, quorum uterque videtur aliquid haereticum reliquisse in scripto: Augustinus de creatione animarum ab initio. . . . Hieronymus in illa auctoritate: 'Sex millia nondum nostri temporis implentur annorum, etc.' Et primo de forma dubitatur. Non enim videtur dicendum: A liminibus sanctae matris Ecclesiae sequestramus, etc." Ed. Dugauquier, 2, 346.

91. "Item. Quomodo habebitur pro indefenso qui citari non potest? Quomodo condamnari potest tanquam contumax qui vocantis non potest auctoritatem contemnere? Certum est etiam quod per testes agi non potest adversus sic absentem, et quomodo scivit Ecclesia et habuerit tanquam constans ipsum Origenem haereticum hoc scripsisse? Numquid sufficiebat ad faciendum fidem Ecclesiae praescribere in titulo nomen Origenis? Forte aliquis aemulus ejus scripsit, aut si ipse, forte paenituit. Certo certius est quod sicut communicavit Ecclesia vivo, mortuo quoque communicare debet, nisi indubitata ratio fidem faceret contra eum. Dubitat." *Ibid.*, 346-7. Cf. 445-6: "We who are in communion with him while he is alive will be in communion with him when he is dead. But we were in communion with Origen when he was alive, even though we were averse to his heretical perverseness, traces of which were left in his writings, for we gave him confession, the eucharist, and other sacraments when he was in the throes of death . . ."; and 469-70.

92. *De salvatione Origenis*

93. Huet (PG 17: 1178 A), according to Bale (Balaeus), *Centur. 3 scriptorum Britanniae.*

94. *Bibliotheca Mundi, seu Spec. Majus*, vol. 4 (Douai, 1624), Bk. 11, c. 8-15 (415-8).

95. C. 13: *De penitentia illius;* c. 14: *De Apologia ejusdem* (417-8).

Notes to Chapter Four
§5. The Beautiful Captive Woman

1. The polemical processes that Jerome engages in and theorizes about with sublime recklessness have not been adequately noted: *Ep.* 49, c. 13 (2, 133-4). Cf. *Apol.*, Bk. 3, c. 9: "Let us now condemn Origen with the same fervor that we used to praise him before, for he has been condemned by the whole world" (PL 23: 464 B).

2. Examples in *Histoire et esprit*, c. 1, by Henri de Lubac. Cf. F. Cumont, *Rech. sur le symbolisme funéraire des Romains* (1942), p. 10: "This deceptive system of hermeneutics arising from Philo was reaffirmed . . . in Origen's commentaries. The fanciful method of this mighty exegete was destined to be a siren song for a long while, despite its being condemned." One might suppose that the author is speaking of a condemnation of the "method" or of the "hermeneutical system." But Church documents, to the contrary, praise it. And if it is true that Origen depends in part on Philo, the essential principles of his exegesis come from elsewhere. Cf. also R. Joly, in "L'antiquité classique" (Brussels), 2 (1953), 424.

3. Deuteronomy 21:10-13.

4. *In Lev.*, h. 7, n. 6 (390-1).

5. Thus, after A. Ebert (French translation, Bk. 2, 1884, 150), Edwin A. Quain, "St. Jerome as a Humanist," in *A Monument to St. Jerome* (1952), 220-1. Curtius, 48. And, it seems, J. Seznec, *La survivance des dieux antiques . . .* (1941), 46, n. 2; Fontaine, 793.

6. Baltus, *Jugement des SS. Pères sur la morale de la philosophie payenne:* Jerome "uses, in more than one place, the application that Origen makes of the story of the captive woman . . ." (510-511).

7. *Ep.* 70, c. 2 (a. 397-8): "But you ask . . . why we sometimes put examples from secular literature in our works, and so defile the brilliant whiteness of the Church with the filth of the pagans, let the answer be brief. . . . From David, [Paul] learned how to wrest the enemy's sword from his hands and how to cut off the head of the proud Goliath with his own sharp blade. He had read in Deuteronomy, etc. What then is so strange, if I want to make the captive maiden an Israelite, if I want to make something of secular wisdom on account of its eloquent beauty and the loveliness of its periods. And what is so strange if I trim or shave off anything that is dead on her, anything that is idolatrous, sensual, error-ridden, or lustful, and if, when joined to her pure body, I beget native-born children by her for the Lord Sabaoth? My labors are of profit for the family of Christ . . ." (3, 210-11).

8. *Ep.* 66, to Pammachius, c. 8 (a. 397): ". . . and the captive woman will give you many children and she, a Moabite woman, will be made an Israelite" (3, 175).

9. *Ep.* 21, c. 13 (1, 93); a. 383.

10. *Ep.* 66, c. 8: "We know that Christ is wisdom. This treasure trove takes its rise in the fields of Scripture. This gem is purchased with many pearls. But if you fall in love with the captive woman . . . and are smitten by her beauty, shear off her hair, etc." (3, 175). This is, in more accentuated form, the attitude of Saint Basil, whose famous homily on the reading of profane authors does less to show "the usefulness of the study of the pagan classics" than "the danger that they pose and the way to triumph over it": H. I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*, 426.

11. *Ep.* 21, c. 13: "Thus we must beware wanting to take the captive woman as a

wife, lest we sink back into idolatry. If, however, we are deceived by our love for her, let us cleanse her, etc." (1, 94).

12. *Ep.* 21, c. 13: "The songs of the poets . . . beguile our ears with the sweet flow and modulation of their verse" (1, 93), etc.

13. *Patrist. et m. âge,* 2 (1947), 166. Nor could one endorse P. Monceaux, who claims, in *J. des savants* (1925), 252, that his style is never other than "a scholarly style."

14. Thus *In Matt.*, vol. 14, n. 6 and 7 (287, 289).

15. *Philokalia,* c. 13, n. 1 (Robinson, 65).

16. Bk. 2, c. 40, n. 60-61 (PL 34: 63). Cf. A. Quain, *loc. cit.*, 223-4, Exodus 3 and 12.

17. *Ibid.*, n. 60 (34, 63). *In ps. 104,* 109, n. 28, where Augustine is less affirmative (*CCL* 40: 1548). *C. Faust.*, Bk. 22, c. 71 and 91 (PL 42: 45, 461-2). See Chapter 7.

18. "Mulierem pulchram, sed illam Deuteronomio astipulante nubentem, domine papa, tibi jugasti; quam tu adhuc juvenis inter hostiles conspicatus catervas, atque illic in acie contrariae partis adamatam, nihil per obstantes repulsus praeliatores desiderii brachio vincente rapuisti. Philosophiam sc. quae violenter e numero sacrilegarum artium exempta, raso capillo superfluae religionis, ac supercilio scientiae saecularis, amputatisque pervetustarum vestium rugis, id est, tristis dialecticae flexibus, falsa morum et illicita velantibus, mystico amplexu jam defaecata tecum membra conjunxit. Haec ab annis vestra jam dudum pedissequa primoribus; haec tuo lateri comes inseparabilis, sive in palaestris exercereris urbanis, sive in abstrusis macerarere solitudinibus; haec athenaei consors, haec monasterii, tecum mundanas abdicat, tecum supernas praedicat disciplinas. Huic copulatum te matrimonio qui lacessiverit, sentiet Ecclesiae Christi Platonis Academiam militare teque nobilius philosophari." *Ep.*, Bk. 9, 9 (PL 58: 625 AB).

19. *Mor.*, Bk. 2, c. 16, n. 28-9 (PL 75: 568-9); c. 34-35 (582-4). Cf. Rabanus, *In Ez.* (110: 599 BD).

20. C. 18 (PL 83: 367-8).

21. The words "superstitio" and "superstitiosus" recur constantly in Bk. 2 of the *De doctrina christiana,* twice in c. 40.

22. "Oportet primum de ea auferre et resecare omnem *superstitionis* ejus immunditiam, et sic eam in studio veritatis assumere. Nihil enim mundum habent disciplinae gentium, quia nulla apud infideles sapientia est, cui immunditia aliqua *vel superstitio* non sit admixta." C. 18, n. 7 (PL 83: 368 CD).

23. "We should do a job of cleaning and purifying, and we should shear away and remove everything that is dead and worthless from the knowledge that comes from them, and so at last we can make her our wife. . . . For the women of our enemies have nothing that is clean, because there is no wisdom in their midst, for there is no uncleanness mixed in with wisdom" (391). Cf. *In Jos.*, h. 7, n. 7 (334-5).

24. *In Deut.*, 21 (PL 91: 389 CD); *O. sup. Deut.*, c. 18 (93: 415 AC).

25. The spoils of the Egyptians: Cassiodorus, *Inst.*, c. 28 (PL 70: 1142 AC); Bede (91: 589-90). Autpert (586-7); Rabanus, *Cl. inst.*, Bk. 3, c. 26 (107: 404 AB); J. Scotus, *Div. nat.*, Bk. 3, c. 35 (122: 724 A); Prudentius of Troyes (115: 1016 C); Rathier of V. (136: 454-5, 650-51); William of Hirschau (150: 1641 C); Manegold, *C. Wolf.*, c. 10 (155: 158); Conrad of Hirschau, *Dial. sup. auct.* Rupert (167: 583 C); Hugh Metel, *Ep.* 11 (p. 343); Anonymous summa (Parent, *Beitr. Bäumker* [1935], 3, 307); etc.

26. "captiva gentilis"

27. "Typus mulieris captivae tenendus est. . . . *Hoc facere solemus,* quando poetas

gentiles legimus, quando in manus nostras libri veniunt sapientiae saecularis." *Clericalis institutio*, Bk. 3, c. 18 (PL 107: 396 AB).

28. *Ibid.*: "More than anything else they ought to fear lest this liberty that we take should be a stumbling block to those who are weak, lest our brother who is weak in knowledge should perish, when he sees us lapsing into idolatry, for it is on behalf of our brother that Christ died" (396 BD). Jerome, *Ep.* 21, c. 13 (1, 94-5).

29. *De praed. c. J. Scot* (PL 115: 1016 CD).

30. *Ep.* 4, n. 8: "as was explained to me by you to help me when my mind was resisting what Jerome said, in which you warn that the captive woman's head should be shaved and that her eyebrows and all the hair on her body should be plucked and that this is the state in which she should be introduced to your spiritual embraces." Cf. also the continuation of this passage (Madoz, 120-1).

31. *Ibid.*: "Look how Paul the Apostle cut the hair of this captive woman" (on Acts 17:23; 432 AB).

32. "Philosophos vero saecularisque sapientiae libros quando legebat, illud sagaci sectabatur industria, quod ad legislatorem divina vox in legis Secundatione praecipit de captiva quae, sumpto calvitio, unguibus praesectis, pilis abrasis, omnibus purgata sordibus, ejus a quo capta fuerat transibat in amplexus. Hac quippe similitudine, quae in philosophorum libris reperiebantur utilia, haec sua dignabatur memoria; quae vero superflua, de amore sc. rerumque saecularium cura, haec quasi venenata radebat et mortifera, his calvitium inducebat, haec unguium more ferro acutissimo desecabat." *Vita S. Maioli, auct. Syro nom.*, Bk. 2, c. 4 (PL 137: 755 CD).

33. *Ep.* 3, n. 2: "For although we are not prohibited by the old law from marrying a foreign born woman, we should not do so unless the hair on her head is shorn and everything else that is mysteriously superfluous is cut off and we are constrained to fear Phinehas, the scourge of the Syrian (Numbers 25:7)" (PL 136: 650 B).

34. "quasi venenata radebat et mortifera"

35. "in legum decretis ac philosophicis argumentis," PL 162: 842 A; "he gave them a shorn head, he cut off all this with a sharp knife as if he were paring nails." These are the very terms used by the biographer of Saint Maieul. It is clear here that there is some linkage between the two.

36. *Op.* 15, c. 11, *De monachis qui grammaticam discere gestiunt:* "We shear off the woman's hair, when we lop off superfluous meanings from the discipline of reason. We even trim her nails, when we cut away all its dead and superfluous works. She is even bidden to put off the clothes which she had on when she was captured, so as to demonstrate the truth of the need to eradicate certain things . . ." (PL 145: 307 AB). Etienne Gilson comments on this passage in *Et. de phil. méd.* (1921), 33-8.

37. "Quidquid sane illis antea superfluum didicit, in hujus scholae nobilioribus studiis amputavit; quidquid illic mendacii, quidquid superstitionis edocuit, in ecclesiasticae puritatis disciplina correxit. Unde per Moysen lege decernitur ut mulieri bello captae et in conjugium victoris electae, corporis superfluitas abscindatur etc." *S.* 6 (PL 144: 537 D, 540-1). Next comes the image of the spoils (541 BD); similarly *Op.* 32, c. 9 (145: 560 D).

38. *Op.* 36, c. 5 (145: 603 C). See above, Chapter 1.3.

39. *Ibid.* (603 CD). It will be noted, however, that in the first text Peter addresses himself to monks. In the second, he speaks of a man who should actually have converted. In the third, he breaks out against a real and serious abuse. He is not a fideist

who is opposed to rational activity. He rejects "fables and fictions" in the name of the "solid truth of true reason" (140: 307 B).

40. *In Deut. 21:* "Certain exegetes have taken this woman to mean the teachings of the philosophers. Nevertheless, I, for my part, believe that she is the soul of man" (PL 164: 519 A).

41. "Captivos ideo gentiles adveho nugas,
Laetor captivis victor ego spoliis . . .
Hostili praedo ditetur lingua latina,
Graecus et Hebraeus serviat edomitus.
In nullis nobis desit doctrina legendi,
Lectio sit nobis et liber omne quod est."

Ad Dom. Constantiam, v. 129-34; Phyllis Abraham, *Les oeuvres poétiques de B. Bourgueil* (1926); H. Pasquier, *Baudri abbé de Bourgueil, et archev. de Dol* (1878).

42. *Ep.*, Bk. 4, 21. "You have taken the spoils from the vanquished enemy, and by crossing the desert in your wanderings you have erected a precious tabernacle to God in your heart, using the treasures of the Egyptians" (PL 179: 348 A). After the first few words, Peter cuts things short.

43. *Ep.* 1: "Recently . . . I was set free in Babylon, and being freed from Babylon, I married the captive woman of Deuteronomy, once her nails had been trimmed and her hair had been cut and her earlier way of life had been repudiated" (316).

44. *In Deut.*, 21, 10-13 (PL 113: 473-4).

45. *Defl.*, Bk. 2 (PL 157: 1103 BC).

46. P. 2, Bk. 3, c. 112, *De muliere capta in bello* (J. Châtillon, 265-6). We find the captive woman once again, in a fragmentary discussion published by A. Landgraf, *Biblica*, 37, 407 (the author also seems to reject every literal meaning).

47. *S.* 23 (PL 205: 725-6).

48: "in numero captivorum pulchra mulier adamatur, cum in scripturis peregrinis aliquis utilis doctrina, quae placeat, reperitur." *S.* 22 (711 C). With an excess of subtle perspicacity he believes that the image of the captive woman can be found in Augustine's *Doct. christ.*, Bk. 2, c. 18, n. 28 (PL 34: 49; 205: 712 A).

49. *Loc. cit.*: "we have converted to our dogma"; c. 26: "converted" (404 D, 405 A). Cf. Trithemius, *V. Rab.*, Bk. 1: "He converted secular branches of knowledge to the service of Divine Scriptures" (PL 107: 84 B). Cf. Augustine, *Doct. chr.*, Bk. 2, c. 11, n. 60: "things that have been converted to a Christian use and purpose"; n. 61: "it will be converted . . . to use in the cult of the one God" (Combès-Farges, 430).

50. Profane knowledge should be converted in order to become the wise man's friend, after having been his courtesan (PL 167: 1764 B).

51. *S.* 22: "so that he might make the jugs that were full of water pour forth wine to the banqueters" (PL 205: 710 D). Rupert also demonstrated it by using another symbol, taken from the story of the widow of Zarephath: *In Abdiam* (168: 399 BC).

52. "Egressi sunt namque ad pugnam doctores ecclesiastici contra inimicos suos cum, armati gladio spiritus, quod est verbum Dei, ad subvertenda mundanae sapientiae dogmata processerunt. . . ." *S.* 22 (PL 205: 710-12; 711 B, citing 1 Cor. 10). Even the exordium is significant: "When I saw that the bombastic words of the philosophers and the absurdities of those who speak grandly about very little, the mere trappings of words, were battering down the hearts of some of the faithful, I wanted my ignorance

and everybody else's to be assuaged with a shake of my head and a snort of disapproval, and living, as I admit, like a Pharisee, I said to myself: 'If they had not incited the promise of faith, they would in any case know whose is the knowledge that touches them and what kind it is, because it is a sinner's.' But what is it in this that has displeased me, unless it is Christ speaking to the Samaritan woman?" (710 CD).

53. *Histoire littéraire de la France,* 16, 429-30. On Garnier: J. C. Didier, "Garnier de Rochefort, sa vie et son oeuvre, état des questions," *COCR* 17 (1955), 145-58. It is readily seen that images like this were much more than just a warrant "to find arguments and literary adornments for Christian writings," as F. B. Artz says, in *The Mind of the Middle Ages,* 3d ed., 67.

54. "This can be understood morally about the book published by pagan philosophers, which was so pleasing to us, precisely because many ideas congruent with truth are to be found in it. Once superfluous matter has been trimmed away, we can convert what is left to our use." On Jacques: *Histoire littéraire de la France,* 12, 809-46. His great fame (cf. *Histoire littéraire de la France,* 29, 547) must have contributed to the broad diffusion of the image.

55. "philosophorum figmenta"

56. ". . . Puella etiam de hostibus capta, quae pilis rasis et ungulis circumcisis viro Israelitico jungitur, dominari non debet eidem, sed obsequi potius ut subjecta." 7 July 1228 (Dent.-Chat., *Chartul.,* 1, 114, n. 59); P. Vignaux, *Philosophie au moyen âge,* 79.

57. *In 1 Cor.,* c. 1, lect. 3: "He . . . makes use of the wisdom of the Word. Once the fundamentals of the faith have been taken into account, if he should find anything true in the doctrines of the philosophers, he places it in the service of the faith. For this reason Augustine says in *De doctrina Christiana* that if the philosophers have made any statements that can be reconciled to the faith, not only should these statements not be an object of fear, but they should be claimed from them for our own use on the grounds that they are in possession of them unjustly."

58. *In Tit.,* c. 1, lect. 3: "The one who is learned in Sacred Scripture accepts the testimony of truth wherever he finds it. This is the reason why, in many places, the Apostle Paul refers to things that have been said by the Pagans, as in 1 Cor. 1 (likewise in Acts 17 . . .). This does not mean that all of their teaching is approved. But what is good is picked out and retained, because truth comes from the Holy Spirit, no matter who speaks it. What is bad, however, is rejected. For this reason it is said, in Deuteronomy 21, by way of figurative representation of this truth, that, if anyone sees a maid amid the captives, he ought to trim her nails and hair, which is to say, all that is superfluous."

59. "in obsequium fidei"

60. Father Spicq cites these two texts in *Esquisse,* 235-6.

61. "Colloquio tuo amor, si non est, fiat; si est, crescat et invalescat, donec captiva ancilla tua jure belli et sorte victoriae conquisita, inveniens gratiam in oculis tuis per fructus dignos paenitentiae, secundum legem amputatis a te omnibus ejus superfluis, perpetua caritate et insolubili conjunctione transeat in amplexum victoris." *Exp. sup. Cant.,* n. 4 (M. M. Davy [1958], 34). There is a similar allusion, perhaps, in Aponius, *In Cant.,* Bk. 6: Christ sings of the beauty of his Spouse, the Church that has come from the Gentiles, "cleansed of all her fleshly faults" (106).

62. A. Cauchie does not mention Origen in the long list of authors used by Rupert: article on Rupert in *Bibliogr. nat. de Belg.,* 20 (1909-10), 431.

63. 2, 294.

64. "Juxta litteram, hoc fecisse David tradunt Hebraei de Maacha filia Tholomaei regis Gessur (2 Reg. 3); vid., quod in praelio captam, caesarie et unguibus praecisis, secundum hanc legem uxorem sibi sociaverit, ex qua genuit Thamar et Absalon.

Porro, juxta sensum mysticum hoc ita facere debet ecclesiasticus vir. Mulier pulchra in numero captivorum sive inimicorum, sancta Scriptura est in tractatibus haereticorum. Nam et plerique haeretici sive haeresiarchae in cathedra Moysi, imo et in apostolico culmine sederunt, et, quanquam de divinitate male sentientes, de moribus tamen et allegoricas subtilitate utiliter multa dixerunt.

Si ergo 'aggressus fueris,' inquit, 'ad pugnandum contra inimicos tuos,' id est, si sanctum habueris zelum contra fidei christianae hostes haereticos, 'et tradiderit eos Dominus Deus tuus in manu tua,' ut palmam veritatis obtineas potenti fide et sana doctrina, nos tibi illa legis imponitur necessitas, ut nullam quamlibet pulchram mulierem apud illos inventam adamare non audeas; id est, ut nullam quamlibet utilem Scripturarum expositionem ab illis conscriptam legere vel audire non debeas; sed, omnibus probatis, quod bonum est tenere, et a sola specie mala tibi abstinere licebit (1 Thess. 5). Nam hoc est quod nunc dicitur: 'Quae radet caesariem, et circumcidet ungues, et deponet vestem, etc.' Caesariem namque radere, ungues circumcidere, vestemque pulchrae mulieris mutare, est omne quod pravum, omne quod superfluum est sacrae lectioni amputare, omnem denique speciem malam, id est, sensum haereticum, caute et diligenter auferre, ut uxorem habeas idoneam, juxta illud: 'Dixi sapientiae: soror mea es, et prudentiam vocavi amicam meam' (Prov. 7:4).

'Si autem postea non sederit animo tuo, dimittes eam liberam, nec vendere poteris pecunia, nec opprimere per potentiam, quia humiliasti eam.' Juxta litteram manifesta est aequitas; juxta anagogen vero, judicii lectorum inhibetur mutabilitas, vid. quale in Theophilo Alexandrinae civitatis episcopo, ecclesiastica reprehendit relatio. Qui, cum Joannis Constantinopolitani, qui Chrysostomus appellatur, esset inimicus, lectionem Origenis, cui libenter incumbebat, zelo ejusdem Joannis damnavit, tandemque, damnato Joanne quia se a lectione Origenis non cohibuit, rursus ipse lectioni Origenis ejusdem incubuit. Qui, dum ab aliquo fuisset interrogatus, quomodo ea quae abdicaverat, rursus amplecteretur, ita respondit: 'Origenis libri similes sunt prato floribus pleno; quidquid ergo bonum in eis invenero, decerpo; si quid mihi spinosum occurrerit, hoc quasi si pungat omitto.'

Igitur, 'si postea,' inquit, 'non sederit animo tuo, dimittes liberam,' id est, si quamlibet circumcisam damnaveris, pro experimento tuo lectionem captivam, non eamdem rursus, mutata sententia, ad tuam retrahes scholam; quia humiliasti, id est, damnasti eam, ne non tam per rationem damnasse videaris, quam per invidentiam." *In Deut.*, Bk. 1, c. 9 (PL 167: 928-9).

65. Bk. 10, c. 14, n. 2 (607).

66. Honorius, *De im. mundi praef.* (PL 172: 119-20).

67. *In Matt.*, prol. (PL 168: 1307-8).

68. "Invidia, genita de felle diaboli!" Milo of S. Amand, *De Sobrietate*, c. 24, v. 643 (PL 3: 634). Cf. Hervaeus (*or. Ans.*, 3: PL 158: 866-7); Burchard of Worms, letter to Albert of Metz (MGH, *Scr.*, 4, 702); *Vita Burchardi*, prol. (*ibid.*, 831); etc.

Notes to Chapter Five
§1. Evolution and Mutation

1. Revelation 5:1; Ezekiel 2:9-10.

2. Origen, *In Jo.*, Bk. 5, c. 6 (103); Jerome: "the literal history is on the outside, while the spiritual understanding is inside" (PL 25: 35 A; cf. 24, 517 C, 631 C). *In Hier.*, Bk. 1, n. 5 (Reiter, 9); Gregory, *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, h. 9, n. 30: "on the inside it is through a spiritual understanding, while on the outside it is through the simple, literal meaning" (76: 883 B); Autpertus, *In Ap.*, Bk. 3 (469); Aimon, *In Ap.* (117: 1013 BD); Bernard, *In Cant., s.* 14, n. 8 (183: 843 B); Anselm of Laon (162: 1520 A); Rupert: "the letter is the external light; the interior light in Scripture is allegory" (167: 1468 A); Alcuin (100: 669 C, 1119 A, 1120 A). Richard, *In Ap.* (196: 756 B); etc.

3. "expositio spiritalis," Gregory (PL 76: 71 C); Chromatius, *In Matt., tr.* 4 (20: 337 D, 338 B); Gaudentius, *tr.* 8 and 9 (Glueck, 64, 79, 86); Hilary, *Tractatus mysteriorum* 2, 2 (P. Brisson, *SC*, 19, 144); *In ps. 136*, n. 13; 143, n. 3 (Zingerle, 733, 815); Hesychius, *In Lev.* (PG 93: 930 B, 1157 B, 1171 B, 1154 B); etc.

4. 2 Cor. 3:8

5. Origen, *In Gen.*, h. 4, n. 4: "Let us ascend to a higher plane of understanding" (54); *In Num.*, h. 17, n. 2: "they will lift their eyes to the higher, spiritual understandings" (155).

6. "intellectus altior et profundior," Origen, *In Num.*, h. 22, n. 1 (205); *In Jer.*, h. 14 (PL 25: 687 A); Ambrose: "a deeper understanding" "a higher and deeper explanation" (17: 344 B, 375 B); Jerome: "to seek a higher understanding" (34: 250 B; cf. 25, 1391 C, 1484 B); Bede (92: 109 D); Bruno of Segni, *In Deut.*: "concerning the deep and lofty understanding of the Holy Scriptures" (164, 545 D); Luke of Mount Cornillon, *In Cant.*: "which are crammed full with a higher, spiritual understanding" (203, 506 B); etc.

7. Hilary, *In ps. 134*, n. 6: "for us a more complete understanding" (697).

8. *In Gen.*, h. 17, n. 8: "our mystical explanation produces a nobler meaning" (PG 12: 260 B). Hilary, *In ps. 150:* "the meaning imparted by a higher understanding" (Wilmart, *RB*, 43, 281).

9. Jerome, *Adv. Jov.*, Bk. 1, c. 22 (PL 23: 241); etc.

10. Origen, *In Jos.*, h. 23, n. 3: "according to an interior understanding" (442); h. 7, n. 7: "of an interior knowledge" (334). Greg., *In Ez.*: "of an interior understanding" (PL 76: 1058 C); Bk. 1, h. 9, n. 30: "and the things that he admonishes on the outside are clear enough, but the things that he relates about what is within cannot be fully apprehended" (883 B).

11. Raoul Ardent: "There are two senses . . . in Sacred Scripture: the external, superficial sense, which is literal, and the interior spiritual understanding" (PL 155: 2035 BC); Rupert: "On the historical surface . . . according to the spiritual sense" (167, 796 B); Gregory, *In Ex.*, Bk. 2, h. 9, n. 1: "And so, now that these matters that deal with the external narrative have been investigated, let the discussion return to the spiritual understanding" (76, 1042 B); etc.

12. Ambrose, *In Luc.*, h. 7, n. 134: "by the spiritual sublimity of the meaning" (Tissot, SC, 52, 57); Hesychius, *In Lev.*, preface: "perception is raised from an earth-bound plane to the sublimer heights, and the spiritual understanding within the literal is examined"; "toward a higher understanding"; "toward a loftier interpretation" (PG 93: 790 B, 789 A, 791 B).

13. Jerome, *In Is.*: "in accordance with a sacred understanding" (PL 24: 171 A); *In Ez.*: "sacred understanding" (25: 148 A).

14. Origen, *In Ez.*, h. 4, n. 1 (360); h. 6, n. 1 (378). Jerome, *In ps. 106* (*An. mareds.*, 3, 1, 79).

15. Aimo, *In Ap.*, Bk. 2: "Those who are single-minded build up the perfections through attention to the literal and through a spiritual understanding" (PL 117: 1011 B).

16. Hilary, *In ps. 134*, n. 1: "the growth of an internal, spiritual understanding" (695).

17. Claude, *In Reg.*, Bk. 4: "while we are led by a grace from on high to the heights of understanding" (PL 50: 1177 D).

18. Jerome, *In Gal.*: "We say that the one who delves into all the sacramental aspects of the Scriptures and understands them in a lofty way is truly . . . spiritual" (PL 26: 390); *Ep.* 119, n. 10: "in accordance with the worth and spiritual understanding of the Scriptures" (6, 118); Gaudentius, tr. 9, n. 1: "done historically — according to a spiritual understanding of the heavenly mysteries" (73); etc.

19. Gregory, *In Ez.*, Bk. 2, h. 3, n. 15: "through a spiritual understanding we get a glimpse of that clear and restful state within us" (PL 76: 965 C).

20. Jerome, *In Amos*, 2, 1: "and let him not ascend to the beauty of the spiritual understanding" (PL 25: 1003 D).

21. Gregory, *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, h. 3, n. 19: "alongside the history, the visionary aspect of the words imparts a certain spiritual flavor to our minds, when God sees fit to bestow this" (PL 76: 814 C).

22. Gregory, *Mor.*, Bk. 31, c. 20, n. 47: "their spiritual understanding should be an object of rejoicing" (PL 76: 778 B). Absalom, *s.* 37: "Not understanding the joy that had been promised to the Church in the Scriptures, he was afraid to enter into it . . . stemming as it does from a spiritual understanding" (211: 218 A).

23. Claudius, *30 Quaest. sup. l. Regum*, Bk. 4: "The bread baked under the ashes is to be understood as the history of the law, which contained the spiritual understanding that had been covered over by the letter" (PL 104: 753 A).

24. Hesychius, *In Lev.*: "Let them run to the spirit, and let them understand that the letter is good, when it is used as an instrument and maid-servant to the spirit" (PG 93: 1176 B).

25. *Decret. Bonizonis*, Bk. 3, n. 54: "He will have two tunics, one of them representing the mystery (ministry) of the flesh, and the other the mystery of the spiritual understanding. . . . The Pontiff is the one who knows the law according to both the spirit and the letter" (May, 7, 3, 27) in accordance with Origen, *In Lev.*, h. 6, n. 3 (364); etc.

26. Bruno of Segni, *In Gen.*, on Isaac and his blindness: "he did not recognize the spiritual understanding under the veiling cloak of the letter" (PL 164: 205 C); etc.

27. Cf. Rupert: "He looks with admiration on the fancy trappings of the spiritual understanding that cover up the cheap and shoddy letters" (PL 167: 1473 D).

28. Berengaud, *In Ap.*, v. tertia: "For the ancient Fathers saw . . . the book of the Old Testament, and did not see it; they saw according to the letter, and did not see according to the spiritual understanding" (PL 17: 808 BC).

29. Alan of Lille, *s.* 4: "Let us draw out the spiritual understanding from the historical meaning. Let us seek the sun behind the cloud . . ." (PL 210: 207 A).

30. Gregory, *In Ez.*, h. 10, n. 2: "If the spiritual core that lies hidden in the letter is

discussed" (PL 76: 1058 C); Alcuin, *In Jo.*, "the thicker material that covered the letter and hid the interior understanding represented by the spiritual sense, which is the core of the letter, as it were" (100, 821 C); Bernard, *In Cant.*, *s.* 47, n. 1-2: "That was the literal approach. Now, though, let us examine . . . the spiritual understanding, which is covered over by the letter" (PL 183: 1008 CD); *s.* 86, n. 4 (1196 D); etc.

31. Pseudo-Hugh, *s.* 27: "to inquire carefully into the spiritual understanding beneath the letter, the recovery of the hidden grain beneath the pile of straw" (PL 177: 957 A); etc.

32. Jerome, *In Is.*: "For this reason, after it is considered from the point of view of historical truth, everything should be understood spiritually" (PL 24: 20 B); Arnobius the Younger, *In Luc.*: "All those things happened, but they have a spiritual understanding" (Morin, *RB*, 1903, 72); etc.

33. Hesychius, *In Lev.* (PG 93, *passim*).

34. Hesychius, *In Lev.* (PL 93: 1034 B, 1036 C, 1044 D, 1119 B, 1122 C, 1123 C, 1128 A, 1130 B, 1134 B); Hugh of Rouen, *Dial.*, Bk. 5, c. 7: "by a spiritual interpretation" (PL 192: 1200 D); etc.

35. Peter Damian, *Op.* 32, c. 2: "That whole discourse, to the extent that it is read historically, is fulfilled in us through the whole mystery of the spiritual understanding. What was then done visibly has an application to us through the spiritual understanding (PL 145: 541 D); Pseudo Anselm (Hervé), h. 13: "The present reading has been fulfilled by an historical action that once happened, but it is being fulfilled daily according to its spiritual meaning" (158: 660 B); Jerome, *Tr. in ps.*: "We are anxious to understand things not only according to history but according to the spiritual understanding" (*An. mar.*, 3, 2, 21). Gregory, *Mor.*, Bk. 2, c. 36, n. 59 (PL 75: 585 A). All this is according to Origen.

36. It is in Melito of Sardis (†175) that the first mention of the Old Testament as a collection of books can be found. For the New Testament we have to wait for the antimontanist author who was writing around 192-3. The meaning of the expression is still being debated.

37. The epithet, rare though it is, can be found nonetheless:

> "This abode, which the ancient history spoke of in resounding terms,
> And passages from the modern book bear witness that Christ spoke . . ."
> (Gautier, 1, 174).

38. "novissimum"

39. "novum et aeternum"

40. "aeternum dicitur, quia in aliud testamentum non mutabitur sicut mutatum est vetus in novum," Amalarius, *Ep.* 4 (PL 105: 1334 C); Beatus, *In Ap.* (Florez, 278-9). Hervaeus, *In Is.*: "I will make an everlasting pact with you. . . . For this is a new testament, the testament of the Gospel, that is to say, a testimony to the coming of Christ" (181: 506 BC); *In Gal.*: "but since it was given by Christ, it will endure" (1134 B); Sicard, *Mitrale*, Bk. 3, c. 6 (212: 130 B).

41. "quia numquam veterascit," Augustine, *In ps. 149*, n. 1 (CCL, 40, 2178).

42. "novum dicitur, quia de immutabilibus et semper novis loquitur," Isidore, *Etym.*, Bk. 6, c. 1 (PL 82: 229); Pseudo-Hugh, *In Hebr.*, q. 80 (175: 627 AB); Richard, *L. exceptionum*, Bk. 3, c. 10 (J. Châtillon, 121). Cf. Innocent III, *s.* 2 in nat. Dom. (217: 455 D).

43. "semper novum, quod semper innovat mentes, nec unquam vetus, quod in perpetuum non marcessit," Bernard, *In vig. nat. Dom.*, s. 6, n. 6 (PL 183: 112 A).

44. "quae transire aut veterascere non potest," Rupert, *In Ap.*, Bk. 9, c. 14 (PL 169: 1097 CD).

45. K. Barth, *Dogmatique* [the French translation is cited by de Lubac, the reference being to vol. 1, 2, 1 (99)].

46. "intellectus illius numquam mutatur," Gregory, *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, h. 6, n. 17 (PL 76: 836-7). Likewise for the phrase "in these last days," found in Hebrews 1; Hervaeus: "In these last days, because after him there will be no other words spoken. And so, for as long as this latest discourse lasts, which is to say the New Testament, it is certain that our faith will last, because it will not be able to be exchanged for something else that is more valuable for the attainment of eternal life in heaven" (181: 1521 CD).

47. "aliter tunc . . . aliter nunc," in Rabanus, *In Num.*, Bk. 1, c. 13: "Then the rough and uncultivated Jewish people had to be polished into shape, even while they remained in the shadow of the law, whereas nowadays things are different and the Christian people are being polished by the truth of the Gospel. By seeing the mysteries of the law explained, the Christian people are to be molded into perfect manhood." (PL 108: 631 A).

48. Cf. Origen, *Sel. in Thren.:* "The Church, which is the daughter of the old Synagogue" (PG 13: 661-2 B).

49. Origen, *In Num.*, h. 11, n. 4 (59).

50. "Sine ullo veteris Testamenti velamine Spiritus sancti jam veritas fulget." Isidore (PL 83: 313 A).

51. "antiquatum." Cf. Chrysostom, *In 2 Cor.*, h. 7, n. 3: "the law has grown old" (PG 61: 43).

52. Isidore, *Etym.*, Bk. 6, c. 1, n. 1-2: "The Old Testament is called 'old,' because with the coming of the New it fell into abeyance . . . the New Testament is so called, because it renews" (PL 82: 229 A).

53. "secundum spiritum"

54. "secundum litteram"

55. "secundum litterae vetustatem," in Bruno of Segni, *In ps.:* "according to the antiquity of the letter . . . according to the spiritual understanding" (PL 164: 696 BC); *In Deut.*, c. 34 (550 D).

56. Hervaeus, *In Is.*, Bk. 7; "They lost their understanding of the Scriptures and did not acknowledge Christ" (PL 181: 514 C); *In Gal. 4:* "By all this, it is plainly shown that after the coming of Christ there should be no holding fast to the law. . . . The law according to fleshly observance . . ." (1174 D, 1177 C).

57. "Jam vetera sunt, quae per renovantem spiritum non intelliguntur." Gregory, *In 1 Reg.*, Bk. 1, n. 9 (PL 79: 68 C). Cf. *Catholicisme*, c. 6; *Histoire et esprit, passim; Corpus mysticum*, ch. 2.

58. Jerome, *In Gal.:* "to pass over from Judaism to Christianity" (PL 26: 428 C). Alcuin, *In ps. 127:* "Sons pass over to the peace of Christ in newness of spirit, not in the hoary antiquity of the letter" (100: 630 C); Bruno of Segni: "This testimony is for those who will make the change from infidelity to faith, and will make the transition from the letter to a spiritual understanding" (164: 1009 BC); Godfrey of Admont, *h. dom. 55:* "making the transition from Judaism to the Christian faith" (174: 359 D); etc.

59. Rabanus, *In Paral.*, Bk. 1: "so that the historic worship of the old law may be

transferred to a spiritual understanding of the Gospel, and so that the old may pass away and all things be made new" (PL 109: 335 D); *Glossa, In 2 Paral.*, 4, 21: "for they are transferring the sacred and eloquent words from history to allegory, from shadows to truth" (113: 675 A). Cf. Leo, *s.* 59, c. 5; *s.* 68, c. 3 (54: 340 B, 374 D).

60. " 'Conturbavit me' sollicitudo mentis interna, propter subitam introductionem novi testamenti pro veteri, dum pro libris prophetarum ac legis, quos esse divinos et Spiritu sancto descriptos sciebam, totum subito mundum Evangelii praedicatio compleret." Bede, *In Cant.*, Bk. 5 (PL 91: 1186 A); Rabanus (109: 22 D, 26 D).

61. Origen, *In Gen.*, h. 13, n. 3: "For Christ did not change their names (i.e. of Moses and the Prophets), but the way in which they were understood" (118).

62. "non in eis nomen, sed intelligentia commutatur"

63. "mutatio legis atque sacerdotii," Isidore, *L. de variis q.*, c. 12, n. 4; "instead of the things that will be changed . . ." (37).

64. "mutatio veteris testamenti in novum," Peter Lombard, *In ps. 39* (PL 191: 399 A). Jerome, *In ps. 39* (*An. Mar.*, 3, 1, 45). Isidore: "the transformation of the Old Testament or priesthood into the New Testament or priesthood" (PL 83: 392 D); *Sent.*, Bk. 1, c. 20, n. 2 (586 B); Paul the Deacon, *De temp.*, h. 77: "he arranged to transform the law into the grace-filled holy Gospel" (95: 1231 B); Bede, *Q. in Reg.*, Bk. 1, c. 1: "the transformation of the Old Testament etc." (93: 431 A); Claudius, *In Reg.*, Bk. 1: "The very purpose of those who cross over from the old to the new is so that everyone may aim to welcome not fleshly happiness, but spiritual happiness" (50: 1066 A); "transformation" (1053 C); Rabanus, *In Reg.*, Bk. 1, c. 4: "Then there were these things that were like the transformation of the Old Testament . . ." (109: 26 D).

65. Bede, *In Sam.*, Bk. 3, c. 2: He said, "Convert from the weak milk of the decalogue, so to speak, which is fit for those who are still children, to the strong fare of spiritual understanding . . ." (PL 91: 614 D); Rabanus, *In Ez.*, c. 43: "Both are offered as a holocaust to the Lord, so that the plump body of the letter, which is signified by the law, and the cloudy sky of prophecy, may be changed into a refined, spiritual substance by the fire of the Lord, that is to say, by the Holy Spirit, about whom Saint Paul says, 'aglow with the Spirit' (Romans 12)" (110: 999-1000); Othloh, *Dial. de trib. q.*, c. 46: "he converted all the shadowy ceremonies of the Mosaic Law into the light of spiritual life" (146: 126 C); Sicard, *Mitrale*, Bk. 2, c. 1: "The rites of the Jews and Gentiles were converted into Christian rites, and this was a transformation by the right hand of the Most High" (212: 57 B); etc.

66. Origen, *In Matt.*, 10, 14: "conversion from the letter to the spirit" (18); Remi of Auxerre, *In ps. 41:* "to understand this, fleshly observance had to be changed to a spiritual understanding" (PL 131: 393 B); Baldwin of Canterbury, *De sacr. alt.*, "thus the simple, literal, historical sense may be converted into a mystical understanding and a spiritual sense for the sake of faith or charity" (PL 204: 763 C); etc.

67. Smalley, 2. Cf. L.G., "Allegorical Interpretation," *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, 1 (1901), 403. Cf. J. G. Frazer, *Cycle du Rameau d'Or, Esprits des Blés et des Bois* [*The Golden Bough*], vol. 2, 36: "The history of religions is none other than a long effort to reconcile an ancient custom with new reasoning." The two facts are analogous.

68. A. Robert, "Le genre littéraire du Cant. des cant." *Vivre et Penser* (= *R. bibl.*, 52), 1945, 201.

69. J. Steinmann, *Le prophète Isaïe*, 312.

70. Cf. Albert Gelin, *Les idées maîtresses de l'A.T.* (1948), 5-6: "These people seemed

to be moved by a religious enthusiasm that prompted them always to surpass themselves, to rethink on a more spiritual level what they had lived and thought initially in a fashion less worthy of God. The Old Testament is the story of these continuous leaps and bounds, this catechumenate, this increasing spiritualization." Idem, "Jérusalem dans le dessein de Dieu," *Vie spirituelle* 86 (1951), 366: "Jerusalem . . . the word has come to signify a reality that is more and more loaded with meaning. Do not all biblical words carry a double and triple burden? . . . Finally, we are always finding ourselves confronted by the same biblical stages: history, messianization, eschatologization, and spiritualization."

71. J. Daniélou, *Sacramentum futuri* (1950), 131-2. Cf. A. G. Herbert, *The Authority of the Old Scripture*, 146.

72. Cf. S. W. Baron, *Histoire d'Israël*, 1 (French translation, 1956), 6-8, 133, 182.

73. Renée Bloch, "Ezéchiel XVI, exemple parfait de procédé midrashique dans la Bible," *Cahiers sioniens* 10 (1955) 193-223; 213, 216-7. Cf. Georges Auzou, *La Parole de Dieu* (1956), 96.

74. The Book of Wisdom gives examples of it; its author "sketches a religious philosophy of history, which presupposes a new interpretation of texts" (*Bible de Jérusalem*, 869).

75. "Propheticae scientiae est pro gerendis gesta memorare," Hilary, *In ps. 62*, 4 (218).

76. "Audite quod est mirabilius, librorum veterum sacramenta occultata atque velata, nonnula ex parte a libris veteribus revelari. Nam Michaeas propheta ita loquitur: 'Prout dies, inquit, profectionis eorum ex Aegypto, ostendam mirabilia illis, etc.' (Mich. 7:15-19). Nempe advertitis, fratres, manifestius hic aperiri sacrosancta mysteria. In hoc ergo psalmo, quamvis futura intueatur mirabilis prophetiae Spiritus, tamen videtur velut transacta narrare." *In ps. 113*, n. 4 (*CCL*, 40: 1637-8).

77. "ut non solum apostolica autoritate figuras nostras illos fuisse credamus, sed nec ab ipsis prophetis hoc praetermissum esse, ut etiam eorum eloquio pandente, videntes atque gaudentes, cuti ac securi, de thesauro Dei et nova et vetera concorditer sibimet cohaerentia proferamus."

78. *De princ.*, Bk. 4, c. 3, n. 13 (343-4); *In Jos.* h. 9, n. 4 (349-50). Cf. *Glossa in Ex.*: "the consummation of eternal blessing is in Deuteronomy" (PL 113: 295 B).

79. "Secunda legislatio dicitur, quod significat evangelium," in Bede, *Q. sup. Deut.*, c. 2 (PL 93: 409 C); Claudius, *In Reg.*, Bk. 1 (100: 1053 C). Cf. Augustine, *In Hept.*, Bk. 6, q. 30, on Joshua 24:27: "The renewal of the covenant signifies the new covenant, which is also signified by Deuteronomy etc." (34: 791-2).

80. "Deuteronomium evangelicae veritatis." Cf. Jerome, *Ep.* 78, n. 43: "a preparation for the Gospel" (4, 92).

81. St. Lyonnet, "S. Paul et l'exégèse juive de son temps, à propos de Rom. 10:6-8," *Mél. Robert* (1957), 498-9.

82. Daniel Lys, "A la recherche d'une méthode pour l'exégèse de l'A.T.," *Etudes théol. et rel.* 3 (1955), 5, n. 6.

83. Augustine, *In Hep.*, Bk. 5, q. 49: "these are not called two testaments . . . ; for both of them are one testament, which, in the Church, is called the Old Testament" (PL 34: 770).

84. Origen, *In Jo.*, Bk. 28, 12: "by the manifestation of truth" (404); cf. 1, 6 (11); fr. *in Jo.* 9 (491).

85. Cf. Louis Bouyer, *La vie de la liturgie* (1957), 183-4: There is an essential difference "between the way in which the Temple of God grows in its preparatory phase and the way in which it ought to achieve 'the measure of the fullness of Christ' in its final phase. . . . In the New Covenant the fullness that one had to be satisfied waiting for in the Old Covenant was given once and for all in Christ."

86. Cf. K. Barth, *Dogmat.*, French translation 1 (1953).

87. "Umbram fugat Veritas!
Noctem Lux illuminat!"

Adam of Saint Victor, *Pâques* (Gautier, 26). Idem:

> "The actual thing abolishes the figurative representation
> And light gives illumination to the shadowy darkness" (32).

Peter Damian, *De petitionibus lucidarii:* "Thus, after the very Truth that had been signified came on the scene, the cloak of shadowy meaning went into abeyance" (PL 145: 1177 CD); cf. *op.* 3 (58 C); Pseudo-Hugh: "The actual appearance of truth means an end to the figurative" (175: 914 B).

88. Aelred, *De oner., s.* 28: "With a sudden burst of light Our Lord Jesus Christ broke out of the thick forest of allegory, in the dark gloom of which he had been hidden up to that point" (PL 195: 478 A); etc.; Isidore, *L. de variis q.*, c. 29, n. 10: "But when, at the coming of the Savior, the truth was revealed, everything that had preceded him in the realm of shadow passed away" (86).

89. "inaniter currerent, nisi Christus in eis praedicaretur," Werner, *Defl.*, Bk. 1 (PL 157: 821 D).

90. "omne tempus ante Salvatoris adventum, quasi vacuum et inane permansit," Helinand, *s.* 7 (PL 212: 535 D).

91. Rupert, *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, c. 6: "the newness of the Gospel" (PL 167: 1427 C); Pseudo-Bede, *In Gen.*: "All the great abysses have been breached, that is, the testimony of the Old Testament has been turned in the direction of its spiritual meaning" (91: 225 D).

92. Origen, fr. *in Cant.* (Procope; 181-2); *In Jos.*, h. 22, n. 5: "The shadows came first and the truth followed" (437); cf. *In Cant.*, Bk. 3 (183). de Lubac, *Histoire et esprit*, c. 6.

93. "mons montium, non unus de montibus," Het. and B., *Ad Elip.*, Bk. 2, c. 50 (PL 96: 1006 C).

94. *Libri carolini*, 1, c. 19: "In it the land that is flowing with milk and honey is pledged; in it is promised the heavenly homeland, in which is bestowed what eye has not seen . . ." (PL 98: 1048 D; following Augustine). But Peter Damian, *Op.* 32, *De quadrag.*, c. 9: "Therefore, now that Moses and Aaron are dead, that is to say, now that the old priesthood and law have been dissolved, we have entered into the promised land of the Gospel under the leadership of Joshua. This is a land that is flowing with milk and honey, that is to say, a land that is overflowing with the mysteries of Christ's humanity and divinity" (145: 559 BC). The Christian does not seek, as it has been said, to "actualize" the Old Testament. He declares that the Old Testament has been actualized once and for all by Christ. Leo, *s.* 60, c. 1: "As for the sacramental mystery that has been heralded by many signs, we not only await its manifestation, but we are worshipping it already, for it has been fulfilled" (54: 342-3).

Notes to Chapter Five
§2. The Action of Christ

1. J. Coppens, *NRT* 71 (1949), 31.

2. L. Bouyer, *La Bible et l'Evangile* (1951), 234; cf. 230-1. Indeed, what makes for the reality of even profane history does not consist solely of a densely concrete and progressive notion of time.

3. C. Charlier, *La lecture chrét. de la Bible,* 155.

4. L. Bouyer, "Liturgie et exégèse sp.," *La Maison Dieu,* 7 (1946); *Le trône de la Sagesse,* 53.

5. What moderns seek in the theory of evolution, in order to convey history, is what the ancients would have demanded of the allegorical method. Thus, it would have expressed "a prophetism of progress." There is more than one misunderstanding here. The ancients were not unaware that the history of Israel indicated a progressive journey. Cf. Origen, *In Gen.:* "Isaac was small in terms of the law, but in the process of time he became great in terms of prophecy etc."; reproduced by Claudius, *In Gen.,* Bk. 2 (PL 50: 484 C); Filastre, *Haer.* 138 (*CCL* 9: 303-5).

6. Maximus of Turin, hom. 55 (PL 57: 355 B). Also Hildegard, *Scivias,* Bk. 3, c. 11 (197, 716 B). Cf. *Catholicisme,* c. 5, 6, 8.

7. "prima adumbratio," Augustine, *S. Mai.* 158, n. 1 (Morin, 1930, 381); Bedé, *In Luc.:* "As if the ceremonies of the law, shaped as they were from potter's clay, came first, so that the gifts of Gospel truth might be turned out like vessels of gold" (PL 92: 584 CD); etc.

8. Isidore, *De ecclesiasticis officiis,* Bk. 1, c. 11, n. 1-2 (PL 83: 745-6).

9. "Quod lucet in veteri Testamento, hoc fulget in Novo," Aimo, *In Ap.,* Bk. 2 (PL 117: 1008 D).

10. The dual characteristic has been rightly noted by J. de Fraine, *Sciences eccl.,* 5 (1953), 17-18: "In the New Testament there are numerous indications that highlight the continuity of the divine plan. . . . But, on the other hand, the inspired authors of the same New Testament lay stress on the discontinuity, the break with the old, the insertion of a new and transcendent principle: no matter how deeply the groundwork for it was laid, the coming of Jesus is completely new." The two points of view must be synthesized "into the sense of a superior unity," and not reduced to a "nullification of one of the two terms." This is poorly understood, seeing that the author writes soon afterward: "It is indeed a strange way to reconcile the two points of view . . . to maintain that the Old Testament is absolutely insufficient for the disciples of Christ or at least to uphold the impossibility of understanding it in adequate terms without any reference to Christ."

11. Jeremiah 31:31: "Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not like the covenant which I made with their fathers. . . ." Cf. "La lumière de Christ," in *Affrontements mystiques* (1950).

12. Although there had indeed been a maturing. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.,* Bk. 4, c. 9, n. 3: "achieving the perfect maturity of salvation through the testaments" (PG 7: 998 B).

13. Congar, *Le mystère du Temple,* 252.

14. Cf. Augustine, *In Jo.,* tr. 55, n. 1 (*CCL* 35: 463-4).

15. Origen, *In Jos.*, h. 1, n. 3: "Moses died, for the Law fell into abeyance . . ." (290); h. 2, n. 1-2 (296-8).

16. Jerome, *Ep.* 22, c. 23: "The shadows have passed by, now there is truth" (1, 134); etc.

17. Cf. Luke 16:16; Romans 8:3; Galatians 4:4; Hebrews 1:1-2.

18. Revelation 1:17. Cf. 1 Cor. 15:45; Bruno of Segni, *In Ap.*, Bk. 1, c. 1 (PL 163: 610 CD); Hildegard, *Sciv.*, 3, c. 7: "The fullness of time was in him" (197: 664 B); etc.

19. "operante Christo," Pseudo-Augustine, *s.* 90, n. 4 (PL 39: 1919).

20. Rupert, *In Ap.*, Bk. 2 (PL 169: 865 A).

21. Aimo, *In Ap.*, Bk. 1 (PL 117: 960 C); etc. Mark 1:15.

22. "Ipse qui loquebar, adsum," Origen, *Sel. in Thren.*, 4, 20: "It is clear that the spirit which was at work in the prophets was Christ, who became man and said: 'It is I who speak; here am I' (Isaiah 52:6), since he is the spirit and Lord and Christ" (PG 13: 657-8 D).

23. John 8:53-58. Augustine, *In ps. 139*, n. 3 (*CCL* 40: 2013); *In ps. 142*, n. 2: "For he proclaimed himself through the prophets, because he himself is the Word of God, and they could not have said any such thing, except if they were filled with the Word of God" (2060).

24. "Semen Abrahae, creator Abrahae"; "Dominus prophetarum, impletor prophetarum," Augustine, *In Jo.*, tr. 43, n. 16 (*CCL* 36: 379).

25. And given this paradoxical relationship, they can be said to be both "exemplar" and "exemplum": Pseudo-Hugh, *In Hebr.*, q. 76 (PL 175: 626 C). Tabernacle that the Father has prepared from the beginning: Origen, *In Matt.*, ser. 138 (285).

26. "de quo et per quem omnis prophetia est," Hilary, *In ps. 54*, n. 2 (147).

27. "transitus ad Christum," Augustine, *In ps. 7*, n. 1 (*CCL*, 38). Cf. Jerome, *Ep.* 121, c. 10 (PL 22: 1031); Claudius, *In Reg.*, Bk. 1 (50: 1066 A); Hervaeus, *In Col.*, 2: "Let us pass over to Christ according to the Spirit" (181: 1335 D). Cf. 2 Corinthians 3:16.

28. "transitus in Christo," Abelard, *s.* 13 (PL 178: 485 C).

29. "prae fulgore in conspectu ejus nubes transierunt," Bernard, *In dom. 1 post Epiph.*, *s.* 2, n. 1 (PL 183: 158 C); Richard (?), *In Nahum* (96: 745 C).

30. "in solo Jesu Veritas Dei apparuit," Jerome, *In Eph.* (PL 26: 507 A).

31. "mutatio per Christum," Claudius (PL 50: 1053 C). Cf. Origen, *In Gen.*, h. 13, n. 3 (118); Cassiodorus, *In ps. 72:* "Those temporal praises . . . were not enough and were transformed" (70: 515 D); Pseudo-Bede, *In Jo.*: "The decrees of the law, which is carnal, had to be changed little by little by a spiritual interpretation, when Christ appeared, for he is not merely a lawgiver, but the final object of the law" (92: 694 B).

32. "Illa vetera signa rerum non evacuavit arguendo, sed implendo mutavit," Florus, *Exp. missae*, c. 4, n. 11 (Duc, 90).

33. "Adveniens in carne Dominus omnes umbrosas mosaicae legis caeremonias ad spiritualis vitae lucem convertit," Othloh, *Dial. de trib. quaest.*, c. 46: "Just as the whole world is illuminated by the sun when it has risen, and all shadows are put to flight, thus it was when he came, etc." (PL 146: 126 C); Honorius: "Christ changes everything that is legalistic into spiritual mysteries for us" (172: 842); Godfrey of Admont (174: 272 D); P. Lombard, *In ps. 118:* "But Christ and the Holy Spirit change it to a spiritual custom" (191: 1067 C).

34. "translatio"

35. Leo, *s.* 68, n. 3: "Finally, it is evident that a transfer was made at that point

from the law to the Gospel, from the Synagogue to the Church, so that, when the Lord sent forth his Spirit, etc." (PL 54: 374 C); *ibid.*: "and the killing of Christ, the true Lamb, which had been predicted for so many centuries, served to transfer the sons of promise to the freedom of faith."

36. "omnem novitatem attulit, semetipsum afferens," *Adv. Haer.*, Bk. 4, c. 34, n. 1 (PG 7: 1083 C).

37. "Venit Dominus Jesus . . . et illud quod erat vetus factum est novum," *De int. Job et David*, Bk. 1, c. 4, n. 12 (PL 14: 802 A). Cf. *Glossa in Reg.*, Bk. 4, 13-14: "The New Testament came into being when the Lord took on flesh" (following Rabanus; 113: 619 D); Richard, *L. except.*, P. 2, Bk. 8, c. 10: "Christ renewed Sacred Scripture, because he showed it to be full of spiritual meaning, while the Scribes and the Pharisees . . . taught only a literal understanding of it" (Châtillon, 349).

38. G. Auzou, *La Parole de Dieu* (1956).

39. Ch. Hauret, "Comment lire la Bible?" *La Table Ronde* (1956), 141.

40. "Lex est umbra futurorum,
Christus, finis promissorum,
Qui consummat omnia!"

Adam of Saint Victor, Sequence: "Let the old leaven be purified," v. 19-21 (Gautier, 47); Hervaeus, *In Rom.*: "Christ, the consummation of the law" (PL 181: 740 D).

41. "Lex antiqua novam firmat, veterem nova complet;
In veteri spes est, in novitate fides;
Sed vetus atque novum conjungit gratia Christi."

Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 32, *ad Severum*, n. 5 (PL 61: 333 A).

42. "Spiritus ipsius litterae, Christus," John Scotus, *In Jo.*, fr. 2 (PL 122: 331 B).

43. Origen, *Sel. in Thren.*: "Thus the prophesied gift toward which, in essence, all prophecy tends is Christ" (PG 13: 659-60 C).

44. "Novum Testamentum, qui est Christus," Bede, *Q. in Reg.*, Bk. 1, c. 1 (PL 93: 431 A).

45. "Evangelium, Christus est," Amalarius, *De eccl. off.*, Bk. 2, c. 20 (PL 105: 1096 B).

46. Lamentations 4:20. Bernard, *In Cant., s.* 75, n. 2 (PL 183: 1145 B).

47. "in finem"

48. "Cum audis psalmum dicere 'in finem', corda convertantur ad Christum," Augustine, *In ps. 139*, n. 3 (*CCL*, 40: 2013); etc.

49. "ad quem dum pervenimus, nihil ultra perquiremus," Cassiodorus, *In psalt., praef.*, c. 3: "What do the words, 'with a view to the end,' mean, for they are frequently found in headings. . . . The end and fullness of the law is Our Lord Jesus Christ . . . and when we reach this end, we no longer have to look for anything beyond it" (PL 70: 14-15); Manegold, *In ps. 63* (93: 810 B), although Manegold thinks that the mention of these words in the heading of Psalms signifies that they have no other meaning except in relation to Christ. Cf. Cyril of Alexandria (PG 68: 700 CD).

50. Pseudo-Chrysostom, *H. in Luc.*, 2, 1 (PG 50: 798).

51. Hervaeus, *In Rom.*, 2: "he is not mindful of the head of all the Scriptures and sciences, which is to say that he is not mindful of Christ, who is the Wisdom of God and the head of the Church of Saints; and because he is not mindful of Christ, who is the head of all sacred understanding and the head of all the elect, it is clear that he is

foolish and false" (PL 181: 1336 D). Jerome, *Ep.* 121, c. 10: Christ is the head "of the whole body, and of those who believe, and of all spiritual understanding" (22: 1031).

52. "Omne corpus divinae Scripturae tam veteris quam novi Testamenti, Filium Dei continet. . . . In Ipso continetur omnis Lex et vetus et nova," Gaudentius, *Tr.* 2, *in Ex.* (26).

53. "Omnis Scriptura divina unus liber est, et ille unus liber Christus est, quia omnis Scriptura divina de Christo loquitur, et omnis Scriptura divina in Christo impletur." Hugh, *De arca Noe mor.*, Bk. 2, c. 8 (PL 176: 642 C).

54. "Verbum Dei, unigenitus Dei, Dominus noster Jesus Christus . . . , magnum veritatis firmamentum videtur esse, si quis sacram Scripturam sic interpretari valeat, ut mysterium ejus, ipsum Dominum, qui eam instituit, respiciat." Godfrey of Admont, *H. dom.* 60 (PL 174: 401 BC).

55. Cf. M. Heidegger, *Essais et conférences* (1958), 251: "logos is at once *legein*, to express, and *legomenon*, that which is expressed."

56. "Christus, qui solus intelligentiam Scripturarum aperit," Hervaeus, *In Is.*, Bk. 8 (PL 181: 557 D).

57. "Liber ipse aperit seipsum." Cf. Bernard, *In die s. Paschae*, sermon on the seven seals, n. 12: "Worthy is the Lamb who was slain, the Lion who rose again, and lastly the Book itself is worthy of opening itself" (PL 183: 280 C).

58. Jerome, *In Jonam*, prol.: "There will be no better interpreter of his own figurative type than he who inspired the prophets and inscribed the outline of future truth at an earlier time in his servants" (Paul Antin, *SC*, 43, 1956, 55).

59. "non aliud quam evangelium, id est, seipsum," Paschasius, *In Matt.*, pref. (PL 120: 39 BC).

60. John 5:39. Godfrey of Admont, *H. dom.* 60 (PL 174: 401 B); etc.

61. Luke 24:25ff. Cf. Julian of Toledo, *De comprobatione aet. sextae* (PL 96: 562-3); Hervaeus, *In Is.* (181: 515 C); *In Nahum* (96: 745 CD); Humbert, *Adv. Graec. cal.*, c. 38 (143: 954 D); etc. Cf. J. Dupont, "Les pèlerins d'Emmaüs," *Misc. biblica B. Ubach* (1953, Montserrat), on verses 27 and 44: "This manner of defining the Easter message corresponds exactly in its object and method to the types of Easter preaching that Luke has saved for us in Acts. . . . The apologetic use of Scripture goes right back to the very beginnings of the preaching of the apostles. . . . There is no unlikelihood in supposing that the apostles were simply repeating the teachings of Jesus."

62. "Magis ac magis aperire Salvator sacramentum suae incipit passionis, quod cum evangelio concordare non dubium est." Ambrose, *In ps. 40*, v. 15 (239).

63. "Omnis enim dubietas tollitur et veritas declaratur, ubi non verbis sed rebus ipsis veritas probatur." Pierre de Corn., *Disp. adv. Sim. jud.* (R. W. Hunt, in *Studies in Med. History* [1948], 154).

64. "opere revelata," Autpert, *In Ap.*, Bk. 7 (573 C).

65. *In Luc.*, h. 1, Jerome's translation.

66. Cassiodorus, *In ps. 138*, n. 12: "And night will be lit up like day. For the things that had, like night, been in shadowy darkness and hidden under a mystical understanding, were illumined like the day, when, at the Savior's coming, the sayings of the prophets were laid open and made accessible" (*CCL* 98: 1247).

67. Jerome, *Ep.* 121, pref. (PL 22: 1007).

68. Berengaud, *In Ap.*, v. 4 (PL 17: 874 C); Justin, *Apol.*, c. 32, n. 2: Jesus is "the interpreter of prophecies that are not understood" (Pautigny, 63).

69. "Christus, inluminator antiquitatum," Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, Bk. 4, c. 40 (Kroymann, 560); Origen, *In Ex.*, h. 12, n. 4 (266).

70. "Legem ergo Moysi splendor Adventus Christi per fulgorem veritatis inluminans, id quod superpositum erat litterae ejus velamen abstraxit, et omnia, quae cooperta inibi bona tegebantur, universis in se credentibus reseravit." *De princ.*, Bk. 4, c. 1, n. 7 (302).

71. Revelation 21:5. Cf. 2 Corinthians 5:17; 1 Corinthians 15:47-9; Ephesians 4:28. Cf. Bruno of Segni, *In Ps.*: "things once understood spiritually are all new" (PL 164: 696 C). Cf. Congar, *Le mystère du Temple*, 179-80 and 200.

72. Claudius, *In Reg.*, Bk. 4 (PL 50: 1179 C).

73. "virtus dominicae passionis," Aelred, *S. ined.* (Talbot, 42).

74. "Dum in cruce Salvator suspenditur, sanctae Scripturae intelligentia mundo expanditur." Irimbert, *In Jud.*, Bk. 1 (Pez, 4, 196).

75. *Vitis myst.*, c. 14, n. 16: "And in this way all of Scripture, which was from him, had its consummation" (PL 184: 663 D). Cf. Chromatius, *In Matt.*, tr. 6, c. 1, n. 2 (*CCL* 9: 409).

76. Helinand, *s.* 10: "The sign of the cross is correctly represented by the last letter of the Hebrew alphabet, for it brought to an end the figurative expressions of the law and ratified the virtue of charity, which contains the whole law. All the mysteries of human redemption, which lay hidden in the twenty-two books of the Old Testament, were revealed in the cross and were brought to full perfection. For this reason, when the Lord was given vinegar as he hung upon the cross, he said: 'It is finished'" (PL 212: 567 B).

77. Augustine, *In ps. 45*, n. 1: "Our Lord's cross was a key by which things that were closed were unlocked" (*CCL*, 38); *s.* 300, n. 3 (PL 39: 1378); Stephen Langton, *Postillae sup. Bibliothecam, glosa in Ruth:* "And Gregory says that the passion of the Lord is the key by which the new treasure-houses of the sacraments are unlocked" (Lacombe, *ADHLMA*, 5, 112). On the cross as key to the Old Testament according to Augustine: Maurice Pontet, *L'exégèse de S. Aug. prédicateur*, 373-4.

78. Peter Damian, *s.* 18: "Thus, through the sacrament of the cross, he united the precepts of the old way to the grace of the Gospel and, so to speak, made something like one unified body of doctrine out of the two testaments" (PL 144: 606 C).

79. Caesarius of Arles, *In Ap.*: "Christ opened the book at the point when he approached the work that his father had willed and was conceived and born. He broke its seals when he was put to death for mankind" (*Op. omnia*, Morin, 2, 222); Gregory, *In Ez.*, Bk. 2, h. 4, n. 19 (PL 76: 984 A); Berengaud, *In Ap.*, v. 1 (17: 789 A); v. 3; "this victory opened up the Old Testament" (808 D); Gerhoh, *In ps. 77* (194: 482 D); Absalon, *s.* 35: "When Christ was incarnated, that book became visible, but was kept closed, because the power of his divinity, overshadowed by the weakness of human nature, did not venture forth openly. . . Finally, in his passion, that book was opened and the virtue of his everlasting divinity, which lay hidden in his manhood, began to break out into the open" (211: 249-50).

80. Autpert, *In Ap.*, Bk. 7 (573 C).

81. Origen, *In Luc.*, fr. 26 (244-45); Augustine, *In ps. 143*, n. 2 (*CCL*, 40); *s.* 300, n. 4 (PL 39: 1378). *De ep. et litt.*, c. 15: the Old Testament was "a time when grace had to be hidden, but with the New Testament this grace was laid open by the passion of Christ as though a veil were being torn in two" (44: 218); etc.; Autpert, *In Ap.*, Bk. 4: "With

his passion he tore the veil in two" (484 H); Paschasius, *In Matt.*, Bk. 12 (PL 120: 963-4); Dungal, *Adv. Claud.* (105: 493 B); Pseudo-Hugh, *In 2 Cor.* (175, 546 B). Cf. Abelard, Sunday Lauds: "the mystical figures cast aside their covering" (178: 1779 B); Leo, *s.* 53, c. 2 (54: 318 A); Absalon, *s.* 25 (211: 150 A). On the multiple symbolism of the torn veil: André Pelletier, *RSR* 46 (1958), 161-80.

82. Claudius, *30 Q. sup. libros Reg.*, Bk. 4: "For Eliseus represented the figure of Our Lord and Redeemer. His clothes are to be understood as the Scriptures of the Old Testament, which were torn, that is to say, revealed to men, when they were fulfilled through his passion and resurrection or his ascension into heaven" (PL 104: 772 C); Aimo, *In Hebr.*, c. 10 (117: 888 C).

83. "in morte quippe sua nostrae oculos mentis aperuit," Gregory, *Mor.*, Bk. 29, c. 14, n. 26 (PL 76: 491 A).

84. Beatus, *In Ap.*: "But when the cross of Christ showed the light of truth to this world" (Florez, 157). Cf. Origen, *In Exod.*, h. 11, n. 2 (253-4).

85. "spiritalem intellectum aperit." Cf. Gregory, *In Ez.*, Bk. 2, h. 9, n. 2: "Therefore, let our inner door be the New Testament, and the outer door the Old Testament, because the one opens the way to spiritual understanding, while the other played a role in the history of sacred eloquence by preserving the literal dimension for minds that were still rough and unpolished" (PL 76: 1042 C).

86. "Scripturae sacrae eloquia spiritualiter intelligi facit," Autpert, *In Ap.*, Bk. 2: "Thus the key of David opened the door and nobody closes it: because the eloquence of Sacred Scripture, a spiritual understanding of which he promotes among the elect through the grace of his incarnation, cannot be outlined to any of the Jews because of the veil that covers their hearts" (541 H). Cf. Bk. 3: "Not only could the book not be opened by any of the angels or men, even its seals could not be broken. Which is to say that the sacramental mysteries of Divine Scripture could not be shown as having been fulfilled through them. They had to be shown as being referred to him. You have to understand through all this that how it was fulfilled cannot be understood by the reasoning mind" (477 DE).

87. "umbram et figuram in veritatem convertit," Aimon, *In Hebr.* (PL 117: 934 A).

88. "litterae finem imponit et spirituali novaeque intelligentiae principatum tribuit," Bruno of Segni, *s. in octava Dom.*: "And straightaway he showed that this sacrament was then completed by him beyond measure and that no longer were things to be done or understood according to the letter, and he said: 'I shall not drink again of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.' In this way, therefore, the Lord fulfilled and corroborated the Old Testament and put an end to the literal, ascribing pre-eminence to a new, spiritual understanding. Therefore the Law was consummated and it passed away, but in its literal sense. It remains and will always remain in terms of a spiritual understanding of it" (*MBVP*, 6, 700 C).

89. Origen, *In Ex.*, h. 11, n. 2 (254).

90. "Mens divina liber grandis est. . . . In Apocalypsi et in Isaia signatus est liber iste, et Ezechiel expanso illo cibatur. . . . Esdras legit in eo distincte et aperte super gradum ligneum crucis; ubi miles latus Christi lancea aperuit, et in sanguine et aqua, accensa sunt omnia christianae fidei luminaria, ut nihil esset opertum, quod non revelaretur . . . ." Petrus Cellensis, *In annunt.*, *s.* 1 (PL 202: 705-6).

91. Paul Claudel, *L'épée et le miroir*, 74.

92. "Terris illabitur lux illa supera,
Qua mortis pellitur caligo misera;
Res nova geritur; panduntur vetera:
Jam nil relinquitur clausum sub littera."

Walter of Châtillon (end of the twelfth century; Wilmart, *RB*, 49, 164).

93. Ephesians 1:10. Cf. G. Auzou, *La Parole de Dieu*, 231.

94. Bernard, *De div.*, s. 57, n. 2 (PL 183: 681 CD). Hervaeus (181: 278 C); etc. Cf. Origen, *In Matt.*, vol. 12, n. 20 (114). Apringius, *In Ap.*, c. 5 (Vega, 32).

95. This is why the Book of Revelation makes the lion the first of the four living creatures: Autpert, *In Ap.*, Bk. 3 (466-7).

96. Bruno of Segni, *In Jo.*, Part 2, c. 11: "Therefore, let the stone be taken away, let the letter that kills be removed and let the spirit that brings life draw near" (PL 165: 544 B); in accordance with Augustine and Bede. Cf. Origen, *In Gen.*, h. 13, n. 1, concerning the well at Haran, citing 1 Corinthians 2, with allusions, undoubtedly, to Mark 16:3 (114).

97. Gregory, *Dial.*, Bk. 4, c. 4, c. 43: "Sacred Scripture . . . which only our Redeemer has unlocked for us. Having become man, he laid open all the mysteries that had been locked up in Scripture by his Resurrection and Ascension" (PL 77: 401 A). Remi, *In Gen.*, 29, 2: "The stone placed over the well symbolizes the literal covering with which the spiritual water was covered over. But our Jacob, that is to say, Christ, moved the stone aside, inasmuch as he broke through the surface of the letter and revealed a spiritual understanding of the Scriptures" (131: 106 C); *In Gen.*, 24: "For the person with eyes, the way that leads to the well is the Passion of Christ, which leads us to an understanding of the Scriptures. And we would not be able to understand the things that had been written in the Old Testament, if they had not been clearly fulfilled in the Passion" (99 A); Apringius, *In Ap.*, 5, 7: "He took up the book at the point when, rising from the dead, he revealed the mystery of the Trinity, which had been hidden from the ages, and opened it up to the world" (35).

98. ". . . Tunc ergo Scripturarum panes in manibus suis accepit Dominus Jesus, quando secundum Scripturas incarnatus, passus est et resurrexit; tunc, inquam, acceptis panibus gratias egit, quando ita, Scripturas implendo, semetipsum obtulit Patri, in sacrificium gratiae et veritatis." Rupert, *In Jo.*, Bk. 6; "For at that point . . . he took the Holy Scriptures with which he feeds us into his hands, when he . . . the true lamb who stood by in the midst of the throne and the four animals and elders, that is to say, in the midst of the Church, was made man in visible form according to the testimony of all the ancient and modern doctors, and it seemed as if he was killed. No, it should be said rather that he was indeed killed, but that he came to life again. . . . through the mystery of his incarnation and the triumph of his passion and resurrection he made his way to the right hand of the one sitting on the throne; and thus . . . he took the book from the right hand of the one sitting on the throne, and opened it, which is to say that he opened all of Holy Scripture, divinely inspired as it was, and with divine power undertook the task of fulfilling it in himself. Clearly the whole dispensation of Scripture for our salvation through his taking on a human nature is signified by the opening of the aforesaid book, which represents the fulfillment of Scripture. For Scripture would not be understood, if it had not been fulfilled in him . . ." (PL 169: 443 BD).

To say, with A. Vaccari, in *Scritti di erudizione e di filologia*, 2 (1958), 158, that "the

Alexandrians, with their allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament, scarcely made any distinction between the old and new Covenants" does not perhaps adequately take into account the fact that is so constantly reaffirmed, namely, the transfiguration of the ancient Scriptures that is accomplished by Christ.

Notes to Chapter Five
§3. The Harmony of the Two Testaments

1. Galatians 3:29. Augustine, *In ps. 113, s.* 1, n. 2: "Therefore let no Christian think that he is a stranger to the name of Israel" (*CCL*, 40: 1636).

2. Justin, *Dial.*, c. 44 (Archambault, 1, 197).

3. Hesychius, *In Lev.*, 1, 2: "Let it be applied to the Church, in which the truth of these figurative expressions is preserved" (PG 93: 872 B).

4. Cf. C. H. Dodd, *La Bible aujourd'hui* (= French translation), p. 76. Nowadays it is the Christian who has Israel's noble blood: Origen, *In Gen.*, h. 16, n. 4 (141).

5. Revelation 11:8; 21:12.

6. "Pars mea haec, qui in Christum credo," Augustine, *In ps. 58, s.* 1, n. 22: "They have the books in which Christ was prophesied, and we have Christ" (*CCL*, 39: 744).

7. Quodvultdeus, *De prom.*, P. 2, c. 18, n. 33: "Thus all the sacraments have been fulfilled. . . . the whole world now acknowledges that the synagogue of the Jews has been left empty" (PL 51: 787 B).

8. "codicem portat Judaeus, unde credat christianus," Bernard, *In Cant.*, *s.* 73, n. 2 (PL 183: 1134 D); Augustine, *In ps. 56*, n. 9 (*CCL* 39: 700); *Civ. Dei*, Bk. 4, c. 34 (PL 41: 140).

9. *Dial.*, c. 29, n. 2 (Archambault, 1, 128); c. 11, n. 5: "We are the true spiritual descendants of Israel" (55); Origen, *In Jer.*, n. 14, h. 12 (116-7).

10. Romans 2:20; 8:5. Origen, *In Rom.*, Bk. 2, c. 11 (PG 14: 895-6), etc.; Augustine, *Doct. chr.*, Bk. 3, c. 34, n. 49 (C.F., 408-10); Leo, *s.* 30, c. 7 (54: 234 B); Pseudo-Maximus, *C. Judaeos qui sunt sec. litteram Judaei, non sec. spiritum* (C. H. Turner, *JTS*, 20, 293); Rabanus, *In Jud.* (PL 108: 1153 B); Bernard, *In vig. nat. Dom.*, *s.* 2, n. 1: "We are addressing true Jews, not literally, but in spirit" (183: 90 B); Hervaeus, *In Rom.*: The Jews who did not believe in Christ "deserved to forfeit the very name, Jew. The Church of Christ is the true Judah" (181: 629 B).

11. Origen, *In Lev.*, h. 5, n. 5 (343).

12. Jerome, *In Ez.*, Bk. 14: "The Jews possess the letter, while we have the spirit. They hold the parchments, while we have him who is written of in the parchments" (PL 25: 480 D).

13. "in volumine cordis," "in mystico intellectu," "in puriore intelligentia mentis," John of Salisbury, *Polycr.*, Bk. 4, c. 6: "Therefore he will describe the Deuteronomy of the law, that is to say, the second law inscribed in the volume of the heart. This means that the first law is the one that is constituted by the letter, while the second law is the one that a mystical understanding recognizes as arising from the letter. It was possible to write the first law on stone tablets, but the second can only be imprinted on a purer intellectual understanding" (PL 199: 522 CD).

14. 1 Samuel 4:22; Gregory, *In 1 Reg.*, Bk. 3, c. 2, n. 21 (PL 79: 172-3).

15. Cf. Augustine, *De musica*, Bk. 6, c. 17, n. 59: "following the authority of the two

Testaments" (Thonnard, 476); Aponius, *In Cant.*, Bk. 6: The doctor who does not transmit the two Testaments in their unity behaves like the Jew or the Manichaean and is a "killer of souls" (114-5).

16. Origen, *In Num.*, h. 9, n. 4 (59); Rabanus, *In Num.*, Bk. 2, c. 19 (PL 108: 685-6); Bruno of Segni, *In Ex.*, c. 24: "Both Testaments become new, if we come to understand them spiritually" (164: 305 D). Petrus Cellensis (202: 1059 AB).

17. "a Testamento Dei alienus," Bede, *In Marc.*, Bk. 1, c. 1 (PL 92: 134 D).

18. Othloh, *Dial. de trib.*, c. 43: "harmony comes about not only through sounds that are knitted together musically in the relative proportion of numbers, but also through any sorts of things that are rightly ordered" (PL 146: 119 D); c. 44 (121 CD). Cf. John Scotus, *Div. nat.*, Bk. 1, c. 72 (122: 517 C); Bk. 3, c. 6 (637-8).

19. Augustine, *De Trin.*, Bk. 4, c. 2, n. 4: "This congruence, or accord, or symmetry, or agreement, or whatever more appropriate word can be used to express the relationship of one to two, is very significant in everything that is joined together in creation, or to put it more aptly, in every harmonious arrangement in creation. I am prompted now to say that this harmonious arrangement is what the Greeks call 'harmonia' " (PL 42: 889). We are dealing here at one and the same time with the harmony established between God and man and the relationship between "the simple and the twofold," which is the basis of music. It is noteworthy that it is the same words that serve also to express the relationship between the two Testaments. Paschasius, *In Matt.* (120: 624 A).

20. Origen, *Sel. in Jos.*: "the New Testament is the brother to the Old" (PG 12: 820 B).

21. Aimon, *In Ap.*, Bk. 2 (PL 117: 1010 C).

22. Hilary, *In ps. 76*, n. 9: "Now also, as always, with regard to these very matters, a connection has been made between the New Testament and the Old through prophecy" (302).

23. Gr. d'Elv., tr. 11 (117); Autpert, *In trans. Dom.*, n. 14 (PL 89: 1314 C); Alcuin (101: 1226 D); Aimon (117: 1008 D); Claudius, *In Reg.*, Bk. 3: "The New Testament does none other than preach to us what Moses, not to mention the prophets, had predicted would be preached . . . when, by a wonderfully harmonious operation of God, things were first revealed thanks to the New Testament and through the light of the New Testament" (50: 1138 BC) Gerhoh, *In ps. 41* (193: 1514 C) and *In ps. 40* (194: 995 D); Adam Scotus (198: 759 A); Baldwin, *Liber de sacr. alt.*: "A combination of the figurative expression and the truth elucidates the mystical significance of the figure by a certain marvelously congruent mutual likeness and doubtless confirms belief in the truth. The figurative expression is so greatly in harmony with the truth that it is useful as a testimony to the truth that was implanted in the sign etc." (204: 731); etc. Cf. Augustine, *In ps. 67*, n. 19 (*CCL*, 39: 882); *in ps. 150*, n. 2 (40: 2193). Amadeus of Lausanne shows Christ as "modulating the instruments of truth with such a sweet harmony" (188: 1307 B; 1305 B: "consonant truth").

24. Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, Bk. 4, c. 39 (556); Origen, *In Lev.*, h. 6, n. 3: "And we said that Moses and Jesus, that is to say, the law and the Gospel, are consonant with each other" (363); *In Rom.*, 1, 10: "the law and the prophets are consonant with the Gospels, they are refulgent with the same glory in their spiritual appearance and understanding" (PG 14: 856 C); Augustine, *C. Faust.*, Bk. 12, c. 41: "such a vivid consonance of things prefigured and now fulfilled" (PL 42: 275); *In ps.49*, n. 4 (*CCL*, 38: 577); Othloh, *Dial. de*

Trib. quaest., c. 44: "what a great consonance there is, if one compares the Old and New Testaments" (PL 133: 118 D); "the Old and the New Testaments can be said to have a great and appropriate consonance"; "therefore each of them, being related to the other, has become quite consonant with the other" (121 CD); etc.

25. Origen, *In Matt.*, vol. 14, n. 4 (280); etc. Isidore, *L. de var.* 2 (20).

26. Origen, *loc. cit.*, and *In Lev.*, h. 3, n. 2: "Do you want to know that these things are in consensus with the precepts of the Gospel too?" (302); Augustine, *In ps. 67*, n. 19: "the Testaments are in consensus with one another" (*CCL*, 39: 882). Maximus of Turin, h. 11: "we notice that there is one consensus and one purpose shared by the New and Old Testaments. . . . Behold how the divine testimonies are confirmed by sentences that are very much in harmony with one another, and although the times are different according to who is doing the preaching, what is being related is not different" (PL 57: 245 BC); Adam Scotus, *s.* 7, n. 8: "in the consensus of the two Testaments" (198: 138 A).

27. Paschasius, *In Matt.* (PL 120: 624 A); etc. Cf. Macrobius, *In Somn. Scip.*, Bk. 1, c. 5: "the harmony of the heavens, that is to say, its concord" (Eyssenhardt, 494).

28. Richard, *Benj. major.*, Bk. 4, c. 19 (PL 196: 160 D).

29. "sed tunc," "nunc autem"

30. "jam tunc," "et nunc"

31. Jeremiah 31:31-34.

32. Hebrews 12:18-29. Cf. 2 Corinthians 3, etc.

33. "illic etiam fumus, hic vero ignis serenus"

34. "distantiam evidentissimam," *S.* 155, n. 5-6 (PL 38: 843-4); Glossa, *In Hebr.*, 12, 18 (114: 668 A); Pseudo-Bede, *In Jo.*: "It is a mark of the learned to perceive the distance between the law and the Gospel, between the truth and shadow" (92: 662 A). Cf. J. Lécuyer, *Le sacerdoce dans le mystère du Christ* (1957), 43-4, 59.

35. Augustine, *In ps. 49*, n. 4 (*CCL*, 38, 577); Fortunatian of Aquileia, *In ev.*, fr. 1: the two Testaments "are in harmonious agreement about Our Lord Jesus Christ" (*CCL*, 9: 367).

36. "Invenitur Christus in eis, quoniam et Christus ipse consensus est." Origen, *In Matt.*, vol. 14, n. 4 (281).

37. Rupert, *In Ap.*, Bk. 9, c. 14: "When Christ came, immediately the whole world resounded publicly with his Gospel, for the law and the prophets had been assimilated to him" (PL 169: 1096 B). *In reg. s. Ben.*, Bk. 2, c. 9 (170: 506 B).

38. "Scriptura enim sancta haeret sibi tota, et uno spiritu copulata est." Jerome, *In Marc.* (*An. mar.* 3, 2, 328); Gr. d'Elv., *Ir.* 11: "we have shown that there is one cause and reason for the two Testaments through the one Spirit of God" (118); Isidore, *L. de var.*, q., c. 1: "Both Testaments, when they are understood spiritually in the Catholic Church, are so harmonious with each other, that they do not appear to disagree in even one particular" (5).

39. "Lex praecessit in figura,
Lex paenalis, lex obscura,
Lumen evangelicum.
Spiritalis intellectus,
Litterali fronde tectus,
Prodeat in publicum!"

Strophe 2 (Gautier, 66-7).

40. "Aenigmata prophetarum
Et figuras Scripturarum
Verbis evangelistarum
Concordavit omnia!"

M.W., 1, 525.

41. "Sic Novum Testamentum Ecclesia catholica recipit, ut Vetus non abjiciat; sic Vetus veneratur, ut Novum semper in ipsis sacrificiis carnalibus per spiritum intelligat." *Sup. Cant.*, c. 7: "in the New Testament rejoicing that Christ has come, while ever awaiting his coming in the Old" (PL 79: 538 C).

42. On Neo-Manichaeism: Fliche-Martin, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, 7, 459-60; 9, 91-9 and 330-44; Héfélé-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, vol. 5, 2, 1112; H. A. Borst, *Die Katharer* (1933); etc. Cf. Raoul Glaber, *Historiae*, Bk. 2, c. 11; Bernard, *In Cant., s.* 65-6 (PL 183: 1089, 1094); Egbert of Schönau, *Sermones c. Catharos* (195, 69 ff.); Geoffrey of Auxerre (Leclercq, *St. ans.*, 31, 196); Raoul Ardent, *In ep. et ev.*, p. 2, h. 19 (PL 155: 2010-3).

43. Augustine, *In ps. 145*, n. 14: "There are those who engage in calumny and say that the two Testaments are not in agreement with each other" (40: 2115); cf. *In ps. 58, s.* 1, n. 22: "And if at times a pagan should be in doubt" (39: 744).

44. "admirabilis divinae operationis concordia," Claudius (see above, n. 23).

45. "consona utriusque Testamenti veritas," Raoul of SG, *In Lev.*, Bk. 17, c. 3: "while the consonance of the Scriptures is our delight" (212 F).

46. Augustine, *De musica*, Bk. 6, c. 11, n. 29 (Thonnard, 424).

47. "carmen universitatis"

48. Augustine, *In ps. 67*, n. 19: "with peace-filled wonderment, like an ecstatic sleep" (PL 36: 824). A modern author has spoken somewhat thoughtlessly on this subject of "false mysticism."

49. Cf. Bruno of Segni, *In ps.* (PL 164: 696 BC); etc.

50. Sicard, *Mitrale*, Bk. 6, c. 5 (PL 213: 261 A).

51. "Vide quantum consonat evangelium cum lege," Origen, *In Ex.*, h. 5, n. 3 (187). The same kind of tone is to be found in Chrysostom, *In Gal.* 4, 30: "everywhere you see that the figurative expression is being observed and heeded" (PG 61: 664).

52. "Vides ubique sibi concordare mysteria," Origen, *In Gen.*, h. 10, n. 5: "see the consonant forms of the Old and New Testaments" (100); *In Ez.*, h. 1: "See the consonance of the words of the prophets and the Gospels" (PL 25: 697 C).

53. "Vides quam pulchre et concorditer . . . sibi invicem concinant," *Sup. missus est*, h. 2, n. 2 (PL 183: 66 C).

54. "Videte, fratres, quanta est unitas Scripturarum," Bernard, *In f. omn. sanct., s.* 2, n. 4 (PL 183: 467 A).

55. "Ecce quantum conveniunt Vetus et Novum Testamentum," *S. in Pent.* (PL 171: 593 D). Maurice de Sully: "and the harmony of the sacramental mysteries should be noted" (171: 714 B). Cf. Leo, *s.* 51, c. 4 (54: 311 B); etc.

56. Regino of Prüm, *De harmonica inst.*, c. 10: "Consonance is defined in this way . . . it is the agreement of mutually dissimilar voices that have been unified" (PL 132: 491 D) (in accordance with Boethius); Othloh, *Dial. de trib. q.*, c. 43 (146: 119-20). Cf. John Scotus, *De div. nat.*, Bk. 1, c. 72: "For [God] himself is a likeness of the like, and a dissimilitude of the dissimilar, an opposition of opposites, and a contrariness of the

contrary. For he collects and arranges all these things into a state of beautifully and ineffably concordant harmony . . ." (122: 517 BC).

57. Origen, *In Matt.*, vol. 2, commenting on "Blessed are the peacemakers . . ."; in *Philokalia*, c. 6 (Robinson, 49-50).

58. "vocum disparium inter se dulcis concentus." Cf. Augustine, *In ps. 150*, n. 7-8 (regarding the diversity of the saints). John Scotus, *Div. nat.*, Bk. 5, c. 36, on the "harmonic sweetness of the universe" (PL 122: 965-6).

59. "Vetus lex novae congruit; id ipsum Moyses, quod Apostolus," Jerome, *Ep.* 64, n. 20 (5, 137); Isidore, *L. de var. quaest.* (180, 188).

60. "Nova lex de veteri Lege texta est," Hildegard (PL 197: 1010 A).

61. Isidore: "The two Testaments . . . are joined to each other by a union of the Holy Spirit" (PL 83: 313 A); Aimo, *In Is.* (116: 756 D).

62. "Novum Testamentum jungitur veteri fraterno faedere," Petrus Cellensis, *De tab. Moysi* (Leclercq, *Spir. de P. de Celle*, 1629). Cf. G. Jouassard, *Mél. S. Salaville* (1958), 109-10.

63. "In veteri Testamento est occultatio Novi, in Novo Testamento est manifestatio Veteris," Combès-Farges, 548-50.

64. "Vetus Testamentum est promissio figurata, Novum Testamentum est promissio spiritualiter intellecta," *S.* 4, c. 8, n. 9 (PL 38: 37). Cf. *In ps. 74*, n. 12: "For the New Testament lies hidden in it, like something hidden in the dregs of sacramental mysteries that are of the flesh" (*CCL*, 39, 1033); *In ps. 143*, n. 2: "The grace of the New Testament was veiled in the law, but is revealed in the Gospel" (40: 2073), etc.

65. "Vetus Testamentum in Novo revelatum, in Vetere Novum velatum vides," *In ps. 105*, n. 36 (*CCL*, 40: 1576).

66. "Nam Vetus nuntius est et velamen Novi, et Novum adimpletio et revelatio Veteris," *Sup. Ap.*, Bk. 2: "Neither the new without the old, nor the old without the new. For . . ." (PL 68: 821 A).

67. "Rota intra rotam est Testamentum Novum . . . intra Testamentum Vetus, quia quod designavit Testamentum Vetus, hoc Testamentum Novum exhibuit," *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, h. 6, n. 15 (PL 76: 835 B). Cf. Aponius, *In Cant.*, Bk. 6: "Let whatever the Old Testament has proclaimed about the future for human salvation through a prophetic use of types be shown as having been accomplished in the New Testament through the incarnation of Our Lord" (115).

68. "Vetus Testamentum in Novo dilucidatum, Novum in Veteri adumbratum," *De tab.*, Bk. 2, c. 6 (PL 91: 439 D).

69. "Prophetia Testamenti Novi, Testamentum Vetus est; et expositio Testamenti Veteris, Testamentum Novum," *In Ap.* (Florez, 278); "The New Testament lay hidden allegorically in the letter of the Old Testament" (274); "The Gospel reveals what the Prophets announced" (276). Cf. Gregory, *In Ez.* (PL 76: 836 AB).

70. "Quid enim est rota in rota, nisi Novum Testamentum in Vetere revelatum? . . . Idcirco autem Vetus et Novum Testamentum unus liber dicitur, quia nec Novum a Veteri nec rursum Vetus a Novo valet distingui. Nam Vetus Testamentum, nuntius et velamen Novi; Novum vero, adimpletio et revelatio est Veteris." *In Ap.*, Bk. 3 (467 H, 469 H).

71. *In Ez.*, Bk. 2: "What is this, which . . . is added, like a wheel within a wheel, other than the fact that the New Testament lay hidden allegorically in the letter of the Old Testament?" (PL 110: 527-8); it is also a formula of Gregory's, *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, h. 6, n. 12 (76: 834 A).

72. *In Ap.*, 12: "The Old Testament is the herald and veil of the New Testament,

while the New Testament is the revelation and fulfillment of the Old Testament" (PL 117: 1013 C); this is the formula used by Primasius, *In Ap.*, 4: "Whatever gives off light in the Old Testament flashes forth in the New Testament" (1008 D).

73. "omnia resonant novitatem," *In Gen.*, Bk. 1: "There are shadowy intimations of the New Testament in the Old. For what is the book that is called the Old Testament other than a concealment of the New Testament, and what is the book that is called the New Testament other than a revelation of the Old Testament?" (PL 50: 958 C).

74. *In ps. 49* (PL 164: 875 C).

75. *In Ap.*, Bk. 2, c. 3, on the book written "on the inside and on the outside": "In other words: 'on the inside' refers to the Old Testament, where the knowledge about the mystery of the Redeemer lies hidden; 'on the outside' refers to the New Testament, where this knowledge is made openly manifest" (PL 196: 755 B).

76. *In Cant.*, with regard still to Ezekiel's two wheels: "The New Testament is within the Old Testament, because the New Testament revealed what the Old Testament presignified, and the New Testament is the explanation of the Old Testament. For they constitute a unity . . ." (PL 195: 1059 BC).

77. "Vetus est prophetia Novi, et Novum Veteris expositio," *In ps. 41* (PL 21: 809 A).

78. "Si spiritualiter intelligatur Vetus, nihil discrepat a Novo," *In Gal.* (PL 181: 1134 A).

79. "Novum Testamentum apertio est Veteris Testamenti," 5, 3 (PL 17: 838 D). He says something like this when he speaks of the cross: "this redemption" or "this victory" "was an unveiling of the Old Testament" (808 AB and D).

80. "Spiritalis intelligentia in Veteri Testamento, nihil est aliud quam Novum Testamentum," V. 3 (17: 807 D). V. 7: "Nobody can understand the Old Testament without the teaching of the New Testament, precisely because the spiritual understanding in the Old Testament is nothing other than the New Testament" (956 C); "If the Old Testament is spiritually understood, the New Testament is contained in it" (923 C); Hervaeus, *In Gal.*: "You will understand the meaning of the Old Testament to be none other than the New Testament" (181: 1134 A).

81. "spiritaliter intellecta, Evangelium est," *s.* 25, n. 2 (PL 38: 168).

82. *In Jo.*, Bk. 1, c. 15 (19).

83. "unus liber," Wolberon, *loc. cit.*; Hervaeus, *In Is.*, Bk. 4 (PL 181: 277 C); Jerome, *In Eccl.*, 12, 12: "Innumerable books are called one law, one Gospel" (23: 1115 B).

84. "Universa Scriptura, liber unus suavissimus," Origen, *In Jo.* 5 (*Philokalia*; Robinson, 42-8).

85. "sunt unum," Autpert, *In Ap.* (469 H); Aimo (PL 117: 1014 C). Rupert (167: 1119 D).

86. "unanimes in unitate Christi inveniuntur — Christus ipse eorum consensus est," Paschasius, *In Matt.*, Bk. 8, c. 18 (PL 120: 623-4). Scripture must be approached as a single body: Origen, *In Jo.*, Bk. 10, c. 18 (189).

87. "Divina eloquia, etsi temporibus distincta, sunt tamen sensibus unita," Gregory, *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, h. 6, n. 14 (PL 76: 835 A).

88. Peter Lombard, *In ps. 150*: "For it is appropriate that the many books are called one book, just as many churches are called one and many heavens one heaven. . . . there is also said to be one book of twelve prophets and, what is more, all the canonical Scriptures are said by some to be one book, precisely because they can be harmonized in a wonderful, divine unity" (PL 191: 1295 CD).

89. "numerosa Scripturarum volumina," Willibald, *V.S. Bonif.*, c. 2, n. 8 (MGH, *Scr.*, 2, 336).

90. Cf. Jerome, *Ep.* 22, c. 30 (end of the "dream"): "to read divine things from now on with as much zeal as I read mortal things before" (1, 146).

91. "omnium divinarum Scripturarum," "divinarum Scripturarum series," "omnis Scripturarum sacrarum ordo," Jonas, *Vita Columbani*, Bk. 1, c. 3 (1905 edition, 156-7); Aldhelm: "heavenly library" (MGH, *A. ant.*, 15, 492). In the seventh century a bishop of Merida teaches his successor "the entire library of Divine Scriptures": *Vitae P. Emer.*, 4, 4 (Marrou, 442).

92. *Ep.* 143 (PL 199: 124 D).

93. Aldhelm, *Ep.* 5; Cuthbert (MGH, *A. ant.*, 15, 492); Abelard, *Ep.* 8 (PL 178: 310 A); *Vita S. Gertrudis virg.* (7th century): "The upshot of the thing was such that he hid away well nigh the whole library of divine law and laid open the obscure mysteries of allegory . . . for his audience" (MGH, *Rer. merov.*, 2, 458). Moreeover, in 1209, Albricius called P. Riga "a versifier of the library" (MGH, *Scr.*, 23, 889); A. Mundo, " 'Bibliotheca', Bible et lecture de carême d'après S. Benoît," *RB*, 60, 65-92 (discussed by G. Penco, *Rivista liturg.*, 38 [1951], 210-7).

94. "Tota Bibliotheca unus liber est, in capite velatus, in fine manifestus," Het. and B., *Ad Elip.*, Bk. 1, c. 99: "The outward shape of the Library of Moses was veiled right up to the time of Christ, and in the end its shape was revealed. . . . Any Library should be understood in its entirety as if it were one person" (PL 126: 956 AB).

95. Sicard, *Mitrale*, Bk. 1, c. 6: "the knowledge of both Testaments or else the understanding of Sacred Scripture, namely the letter and the spirit" (PL 213: 30 C); Aimo, *In Ap.*, Bk. 2 (117: 1013 CD).

96. "spiritalis intelligentia," "spiritalis praeformatio," "praefigurationis significatio," "Ecclesiae praeformatio," *Tr. myst.*, Bk. 1, c. 39-40; Bk. 2, c. 5 (28, 31, 33). Claudius: "it presignified," "it prefigured" (PL 104: 758 B, 772 D, 773 A); etc.

97. "prophetatio," "praenuntiatio," *Civ. Dei*, Bk. 10, c. 32, n. 2 (PL 41: 314).

98. "allegorica praefiguratio," *Civ. Dei*, Bk. 17, c. 5, n. 2 (41: 526); *In Jo.*, tr. 9, n. 10: "everything was mystically prefigured" (35: 1463-4).

99. "usque ad Christi praesentiam," *Tr.* 7: "But now let us see what useful reason there was for the precept itself as it was applied by the Jews historically up to the coming of Christ or what edification there is for us today in terms of a spiritual understanding" (56).

100. "Nos vero, vim omnium gestorum et rationem spiritalem ad Novi Testamenti figuram pertinuisse monstramus," *Tr.* 13 (141). *Tr.* 7: "Let us examine the force, the grounds, and the mystery of that reading according to the spiritual understanding" (76).

101. "praefigurationis mysterium," "promissivae figurae," PL 83: 207 B, 321 B.

102. "sacramenta prophetica," *In ps. 103, s.* 3, n. 1 (*CCL*, 40: 1499).

103. "figuratae promissiones," *De prom.*, P. 2, c. 40, n. 93 (PL 51: 818 A).

104. "mystica significatio secuturae veritatis," PL 204: 712 C.

105. "Veni non passibus corporis, sed passibus mentis, et intellige spiritualiter ea quae tempore historialiter facta legisti." *In Ap.*, v. 3 (PL 17: 813 C).

106. "Ita historialiter ordinantur vetera, ut spiritaliter omnia demonstrentur nova." Rabanus, *Ep.* 12: "And by the figurative expressions of the law may the letter lay open

the sacramental mysteries that the sacred text of the Gospel contains in itself" (MGH, *Ep.* 5, 399); *In Deut.*, preface (PL 108: 839 A).

107. "Sicut serpentes serpens necat aeneus omnes,
Sic exaltatus hostes necat in cruce Christus";

108. "Qui Deus est magnus, librum Leo solvit et Agnus . . ."

109. "allegoriae jocundae"

110. "tituli"

111. "Hoc quod Abram pro prole litat, Christi caro signat.
Botrum vecte ferunt qui Christum cum cruce quaerunt."

L. de rebus in admin. sua gest., c. 32 (PL 186: 1233, 1237).

112. "Vetus et novum Testamentum in simul junctum," Pl. 23 (p. 16-7). On Herrad: Manitius, 3, 1010-4. Robert Will has written that the *Hortus deliciarum* contains "the delicate flower of medieval culture as if it were distilled into a golden vial": *RHPR* 17 (1937), 565. In Florence, at the Ufizzi Gallery, there is a tapestry that shows scenes of the Patriarchs with the following legend:

"This picture reports pious truths,
But they are mystical, dear reader,
A holy figurative representation
Conceals Christ and His Church."

In this second phase of the Middle Ages, the relationship of one Testament to the other gives way to precise details and combinations in an artificial schematization. Thus a tableau attributed to a disciple of Angelico (Florence, Saint Mark) puts the twelve Prophets and the twelve Apostles opposite one other, with each of the Apostles pronouncing an article of the Creed, to which there is a corresponding prophecy (on the same tableau, the candelabra with seven branches is a figurative representation of the seven sacraments).

113. Louis Réau, *L'art du moyen âge*, 28. The symbolism remains fairly external. The same device can be seen on the Chaise-Dieu tapestries (15th century).

114. M. Seidlmayer, *Lex. f. Th. u. Kirche*, 3 (1931), 609; E. de Bruyne, 1, 282. Cf. Raby, *Saec. P.*, 1, 222, on the mural paintings of St. Alban of Mainz according to Ermoldus: to the left, "God's works" in the Old Testament; to the right, the "life-giving works" of Christ.

115. Bede, *H. abb. Wisem.*, c. 4 and 6 (PL 94: 720 BC). Cf. B. Capelle, *L'Angleterre chrét. avant les Normands* (1909), 140-3 and 198.

116. "summa ratione compositas"

117. *In historiam V. et N.T. carmina* (PL 62: 534-6). Cf. Sam. Cavallin, "Le poète Domnulus, étude prosopographique" (*Sacris Erudiri* 7 [1955], 49-66). An elegy by Sedulius, called "A Comparison of the Old and New Testaments," is comprised of 55 similar distichs.

118. "duplex cibus," "refectio duplex"

119. Prudentius, 4 (M. Lavarenne), 201-16. They were "probably meant to serve as legends to paintings representing scenes from the Old and New Testaments": Lavarenne, Prudentius, *Psychomachie* (1933), 16. Eleventh-century gloss on the *Psychomachia* (*Sacris Erudiri*, 9, 66). But, although there are an equal number of them for each Testament, there is not a one-to-one symbolic correspondence between them.

120. Marcel Laurent, *L'art chrétien des origines à Justinien* (1956), 176.

121. "Nunc volo picturas fucatis agmine longo
Porticibus videas, paulumque supina fatiges
Colla, reclinato dum perlegis omnia vultu.
Qui videt haec vacuis agnoscens vera figuris,
Non vacua fidem sibi pascet imagine mentem.
Omnia namque tenet serie pictura fideli,
Quae senior scripsit per quinque volumina Moses,
Quae gessit Domini signatus nomine Jesus,
Quo duce Jordanis, suspenso gurgite, fixi
Fluctibus, a facie divinae restitit arcae. . . ."

Poema 27, De S. Fel. nat. carmen 9, v. 511-20 (PL 61: 660 AB). A mosaic of Saint Apollinaris of Ravenna (sixth century) yields the same device.

122. "In veteri nobis nova res adnascitur actu,
Et solita insolito crescunt solemnia ritu. . . ."

P. 28, *De S. F. nat. carmen 10*, v. 1-2 (61: 663 A). V. 214-22:

". . . Hence the time periods of the works are jumbled, Newness shines outside the walls, while ancient things lie hidden within:
Shrivelled old age is covered by the brow of youth:
The grey hairs of age have blossomed into the appearance of youth.
The old and the new co-exist; the old and the new are not equally apportioned.

They are not the same as is the form of future
And present good; for even now it is worthwhile for us
To be renewed with a pious mind, to follow Christ,
And to be prepared for his reign, once the filth of our
Old life has been cleaned off." (668 A).

123. Does not this notion of "two in three" indicate a frame of mind that is similar to the one we have just seen on the ambo at Klosterneuburg? Cf. v. 22-3:

"But a faithful picture adorns with double histories
The twin panels that can be seen to the right and left."

This is followed by a conjunction of Job and Tobias, of Judith and Esther (663 C).

124. V. 170-5 (PL 61: 666-7). Paulinus is cited at length by Dungal, *Adv. Claud. Tur.* (PL 105: 468-70, etc.).

Notes to Chapter Five
§4. The Symbols of Harmony

1. 2 Corinthians 3:12-18. Rupert, *In Ex.*, Bk. 2, c. 4: "just as he covered his face with a veil, so he concealed the secret of the spirit with a literal covering" (PL 167: 611-12); Petrus Cellensis, *s.* 87 (202: 903 C); etc.

2. Peter Chrysologus, *s.* 86 (PL 52: 443 B).

3. Richard (?), *In Nahum*, n. 75 (PL 96: 745 BD); "the shadow takes flight, whereas clarity returns; the type passes away, whereas Truth is now at hand."

4. "argentum sonat et lucet, aes sonat et non lucet," Alan of Lille, *Distinct.* (PL 210: 710 A).

5. Sicard, *Mitrale*, Bk. 3, c. 4 (PL 213: 107 BC).

6. Augustine, *s.* 130, n. 1 (PL 38: 725); John Scotus, *In Jo.*, fr. 3 (122: 346 AB); Hildebert (171: 1278 CD); etc.

7. Bede, *In Luc.* (PL 122: 470 A); Werner, *Defl.*, Bk. 2 (157: 1120 CD); Vict. of Pettau, *In Ap.* (Haussleiter, 24).

8. Maximus of Turin, h. 111 (PL 57: 514 C); etc.

9. H. 3 (PL 57: 227-30). As early as Ambrose, *De paenit.*, Bk. 1, c. 15, n. 82 (16: 491).

10. Peter Damian (PL 145: 1031 A, 1082 CD); Paschasius, *In Matt.*, Bk. 11 (120: 830 D); Bruno of Segni, *In Deut.* (164: 529 CD); Baldwin of Canterbury, *L. de sacram. alt.* (204: 761-2), etc. Or else the millstone is the cross of Christ, and the woman who is grinding is the Church; Irimbert, *In Jud.*, Bk. 1: "For the cross of Christ is rightly explained as a millstone, because just as grain is ground on a millstone, from which there issues flour, so on the millstone of the holy cross is ground the grain of wheat from which the flour of redemption is sprinkled. Therefore the woman struck the head of Abimelech with a piece of millstone (Judges 9:53), while Holy Church dashes all the proud vanity of fleshly understanding through the mystery of the cross; she shattered his skull, while the Church breaks the weakness of heretical falsehood with the vigor of Catholic truth" (Pez, 4, 310-11).

11. Jerome, *In Marc.*: "When they look for three, they find one. No, rather, they lose three and find one. Not so, if I may speak at greater length: they discover the three of them in one. For Moses and Elijah are more apt to be found when they are assimilated into Christ" (*An. mar.*, 3).

12. *In Lev.*, h. 6, n. 2 (302), etc. Cf. *Histoire et Esprit*, 276-7; *Aspects du bouddhisme*, 1, ch. 3. This is not "to substitute Scripture for the person of Jesus," as M. Harl says in *Or. et la fonction révélatrice du Verbe incarné* (1958), 253. J. Guillet rightly underlines the importance of this symbol: *RSR*, 34, 292.

13. Jerome, *In Matt.*, Bk. 3, c. 17 (PL 26: 122 C); *In Marc.* (Morin, 350-3). Cf. Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, Bk. 4, c. 22 (492-5); Ambrose, *In Luc.*, Bk. 7, n. 21 (Tissot, *SC*, 52, 16).

14. *S.* 78, n. 2-3; *s.* 79 (PL 38: 490-1, 493); *s.* 252, n. 10 (1177).

15. "Veteris ac Novi Testamenti facta concordia," *H. in transf. Dom.*, n. 14 (PL 89: 1314 C); Jerome, *In Marc.*, *loc. cit.*: "Inasmuch as there is one tent for the Gospel, the law, and the prophets; unless they live together, they cannot have harmony."

16. *In Matt.*, Bk. 8, c. 17 (PL 120: 583-4).

17. ". . . Levantes autem oculos, neminem viderunt, nisi solum Jesum — id est, Novum Testamentum.

Ablata enim nube, et evanescentibus Moyse et Elia, Christus solus cernitur; quia legis et prophetarum umbra discedente, verum lumen, coruscante gratia Evangelii, splendet. Ubi enim legis et prophetiae umbra recedit, quae suo velamine mentes hominem tegebat, utraque reperitur in Evangelio. Nam cum tres essent, unus est factus. Tres in principio visi sunt, unus in fine. Quia lex, et prophetia, et Evangelium, quando secundum interiorem sensum inspiciuntur, unus apparet. Lex enim et prophetia, juxta spiritalem intellectum, nihil aliud sunt quam doctrina evangelica." H. 4, *in Matt.* 17 (PL 163: 616 A). Cf. Wilmart, *AHDLMA* (1927), 5-29. As a result of having systematically

disregarded the lights of tradition, the author of a scholarly thesis finds only the following meaning in this passage of the Gospel: "Jesus has a relationship with the world beyond. He talks with Moses and Elijah"; then when he goes on to summarize his interpretation of the whole scene, an interpretation that strikes him as "absolutely evident," he does not take Moses and Elijah into account at all. Félix Gils, *Jésus prophète d'après les évangiles synoptiques* (Louvain, 1957), 74 and 76.

18. Thus Bede, *Prov.*, A: "We have water being turned into wine on our behalf, when sacred history is changed into a spiritual understanding for us" (PL 90: 1091 D); Pseudo-Bede, *In Jo.* (92: 657-62); Othlo (146: 302 B); Pseudo-Maximus of Turin, h. 2 (57: 917 D); etc. Following Gregory, *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, h. 6, n. 7 (76: 831 BC). As early as Origen, *In Jo.*, Bk. 13, c. 62 (24-5); *in Jo.* fr. 74 (541); Gaudentius, *tr.* 8 (65-6); Augustine, *In Jo., tr.* 9 (*CCL*, 36: 90-100). Thus it is not a simple matter of "Gregory's ingenious comparison" (Battifol, *S. Grég. le Grand*, 1928, 95).

19. Thus Odilo of Cluny, *s.* 2: "The wine arises spiritually from the water, for, when the letter of the law gives way, the grace of the Gospel shines through Christ" (PL 142: 997 C). Othlo, *De cursu sp.*, c. 20: "As far as rising is from setting, so far is the distance between a spiritual understanding of the New Testament and a carnal knowledge of the Old, which he himself changes by his power just as water is changed into wine, when he taught us that all of creation is to be understood spiritually" (146: 212 C); God. of Admont: "to transform it to the desired, flavorful bouquet of understanding . . . ; to be drunk . . . with the wine of the spiritual sense etc." (174: 1196 CD); Rupert, *In Jo.* (169: 284-90); Hildebert's Collection, *In Ep., s.* 1 and 3 (171: 409, 415); poems (1278 B); Aelred, *s. ined.* 3 (Talbot, 39-46); Joachim of Flora, *Sup. 4 ev.* (Buon., 20, 128, 146); etc.

20. "Aquas legales in vina evangelica vertit virtute sua," Prose, tenth-eleventh century (M.W., 1, 145). "At this point, before his coming, the letter of the law is drunk like water; now it is changed into wine, and Christ is present as the guest": Einsideln, eleventh century (Blume-Bannister [1911], 57).

21. Othloh, *ibid.*: "and there is a wedding feast that occurs within us. Thus our soul becomes the bride, and the groom himself deigns to change the water of our fleshly life, which we have been drinking up to this point on account of the necessity borne upon us by our mortal nature or because of an ill-favored custom, into the wine of spiritual life" (PL 146: 213 A); etc.

22. Pseudo-Ambrose, *s.* 8, n. 6: "This whole sign contains the mystery of the resurrection. . . . The water turned into wine . . . signifies that the substance of man, which is weak and worthless and deathly sick, conditioned as it is by its mortality, is to be changed by the resurrection into glory" (PL 17: 620 A).

23. ". . . Et nova Lex veterem superat gustata saporem," Marbodius, *Carmen* 25, *De Epiphania* (PL 171: 1663 A). Following Origen, *In Cant.*, Bk. 1 (94). Hildebert (1278 B).

24. Geoffrey Babion, *s. in Epiph.*: "The ancient law is compared to water. . . . The Gospel is wine . . ." (PL 171: 415 C); Rupert, *In Jo.*, Bk. 2 (169: 286 CD).

25. "Verbum Dei caro factum, vetus adimplevit Testamentum, veteres reseravit Scripturas, convertit eas in vinum, transferens eas in allegoricum et moralem intellectum." Herbert de Losinga, *s. in Epiph.* (G.S., 2, 60); Pseudo-Hild., *s.* 13 (PL 171: 409 B).

26. Gr. of Elv., *In Cant.*: "the waters that spring forth from the gospels are better than the wine of prophetic preaching" (*BLE*, 1906, 241; cf. 245).

27. *Allegoriae*: "The wine of spiritual understanding as in the gospel. You have

saved the good wine, that is to say, you have saved the spiritual understanding for things that are spiritual" (PL 112: 1078); Gerhoh, *In ps. 18* (193: 911 A); Isaac of Stella, *s.* 10 (194: 1725 D); Garnier, *s.* 8 (205: 621 CD); Bonaventure, *In Hexaem.*, coll. 19, n. 8; "The Holy Spirit does not give spiritual understanding unless a man fills his jug, namely his capacity, with water, that is to say, with a notion of the literal sense; and after that, God changes the water of the literal sense into the wine of spiritual understanding" (Q., 5, 421).

28. Thus Aelred, *In Epiph., de trib. gen. nupt.* (*S. in.* 3; Talbot, 39-47).

29. Bede, *In Cant.*, Bk. 2, c. 1: "The extent to which his wine surpasses the wine of the law has a mystic significance in the Gospel, where, when the old wine ran out in the typical wedding feast of the Church, he himself made new wine from water, and straightaway merited great praise" (PL 91: 1085 C). Rupert, *In Jo.*, Bk. 2 (169: 285 CD).

30. Hugh, *In Gen.*, c. 6: "On the fourth day he made the sun from the above-mentioned light or fire by giving them the benefit of a splendid shape; because the sun was made from the above-mentioned fire, it is our conjecture that in some way the Gospel was made from the law, and at the wedding wine was made from water" (PL 175: 35 B).

31. M. E. Boismard, *Du Baptême à Cana* (1956), 139-40: "The wine symbolizes Scripture: when the Law and the Prophets came to be lacking, Christ introduced a new set of teachings. There are good reasons that militate in favor of the interpretation proposed by Origen." The same explanation is adduced by Dodd and R. H. Lightfoot.

32. Gr. of Elv., *In Cant.* (*BLE*, 1906, 241-2). Rupert: "Isaac brought Rebecca into this tent and took her as a wife; that is to say, when the meanings of events like this were unlocked, Christ launched a spiritual understanding of the Scriptures and instituted a new Church on his own account" (PL 167: 447 C); "The true Isaac, that is to say, Our Lord Jesus Christ, took Holy Scripture, the mother of us all, under whose aegis we are born again, as his spouse, that is to say, as something that was needed for the preaching of the Gospel" (449 A), etc.

33. Adam Scotus, *s.* 47, c. 18: "Then the water will be changed into wine, because man will pass over into God" (PL 198: 439-40); Garnier of Rochefort, *s.* 9: "The changing of water into wine is none other than the fact that the ancient, traditional law, insofar as it is insipid in its literal aspect, inebriates banqueters with the spiritual savor of charity when it is joined to Christ and the Church" (205: 633 A). Cf. Gerhoh, *Ad Petrum phil.*: "through the mystery of the incarnation the water of human nature is changed into the flavorful wine of divine power" (*Op. in.* 1, 358); Bede, *In Job* (91: 932 B); Hugh, *De Savam.*, Bk. 1, P. 1, c. 15 (176: 199 A).

34. "Hujus Scripturae litteralis sensus velut aqua in vinum convertitur, dum spirituali intelligentia *filiis nuptiarum* ita propinatur." *In Jo.*, Bk. 2 (PL 169: 288 A).

35. "Mystice vero aqua in vinum in nuptiis mutata hoc insinuat, quod quando Deus humanae naturae sociatus est, et facti sunt duo in carne una, Christus et Ecclesia, tunc lex quae hactenus carnaliter fuerat observata, per dispensationem humanitatis Christi spiritualiter est intellecta. Nos quoque, de futura et insipida veteris hominis vita, per hanc Christi et Ecclesiae societatem translati sumus in filiorum Dei adoptionem." *S.* 10 (PL 162: 575 BC). Pseudo-Hildebrand (G. Babion), *s.* 15 (171: 415 C); etc.

36. Hebrews 9:5. Exodus 25:17-20 and 37:6-9.

37. *In Is.*, Bk. 3, c. 6: "Thus a certain person impiously understands the two seraphim as Son and Holy Spirit" (PL 24: 94 C). Cf. *Ep.* 18, n. 4 (1, 75-8); *In Isaiam*, 6,

1-7 (*An. mar.*, 3, P. 3, 119-21). On the connection between this little treatise and Jerome: F. Cavallera, *S. Jérôme*, 2, 81-6).

38. Origen, *In Is.* h. 1, n. 2; h. 4, n. 1 (244-5, 257-9). Cf. *In Rom.*, Bk. 3, c. 8 (PG 13: 948 AC); *De princ.*, Bk. 1, c. 3, n. 4 (52-3).

39. *Dem. apost.*, c. 10 (J. P. Smith, 1952, 53-4 and 146, note). Cf. J. Daniélou, *Théol. du judéo-christianisme* (1958), 185-91; M. Th. d'Alverny, "Les anges et les jours," *Cahiers archéol.* 9 (1957), 292.

40. "cujus ego detestandam expositionem in duo testamenta mutavi," *Ep.* 84, n. 3 (4, 127-8). Cf. *Ep.* 18, n. 9 and 14 (1, 64 and 68-9).

41. *In Is.*, Bk. 3, c. 6, 2-3: "Some of the Latins understand the two seraphim as the old and new documents" (PL 24: 95 A). Cf. Gaudentius, *Tr.* 9: "the two wings of the Seraphim, which represent the Law and the Prophets no less than the Old and New Testaments" (87).

42. Gregory, *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, h. 6, n. 15 (PL 76: 835-6); Bede, *De tab.*, Bk. 1, c. 5 (91: 404-6); *De templo Sal.*, c. 13 (766-7); Claudius, *In Reg.*, Bk. 3 (50: 1126-7); Rabanus, *In Num.*, Bk. 1, c. 13 (108: 834 B); *in Paral.*, Bk. 3, c. 3 (109: 429-32); Angelome, *In Reg.*, Bk. 3 (115: 428-9); *Miscell.*, Bk. 7, inscription 22 (177: 877 CD); Godfrey of Admont, *In Script.*, h. 13 (174: 1115-6); Adam Scotus, *Trip. tab.*, P. 3, c. 8, n. 153 (198: 759 AB); Richard, *L. except.*, P. 2, Bk. 3, c. 13 (Châtillon 259); etc. Cf. Cassian, coll. 14, c. 10 (*SC*, 54, 196).

43. "quia utraque Testamenta in nullo a se discrepant," Gregory, *loc. cit.*; Beatus, *In Ap.* (277); Isidore, *L. de variis q.*, c. 1 (1).

44. "quia Testamenta pari de Domino attestatione consentiunt," *L. carolins*, Bk. 1, c. 20 (PL 98: 1052 A). Claudius, *loc. cit.* (1127 B).

45. "quia idem sentiunt, consona dicunt," Rupert, *In Jo.*, Bk. 1 (PL 169: 225 C); *In Ex.*, Bk. 4, c. 6 (167: 702-3); *De div. off.*, Bk. 3, c. 15 (170: 74 BD); Gerhoh, *Exp. sup. canonem:* "as if . . . the two testaments themselves gazed back and forth at one another through the mediation of Christ" (*Op. in.*, 1, 13).

46. Bruno of Segni, h. 137 (PL 165: 845 AB; h. 141 (859 BC), *In Is.* (*Sp. casin.*, 3, 21). Cf. the mosaic of Theodulf at Germigny (apse, c. 810), with its simple, multiple symbolism.

47. "quoniam tota sacra Scriptura, tam novi quam veteris testamenti, ad solum respicit Christum," God. of Admont, h. dom. 15 (PL 174: 108 B); Richard, *Benj. major.*, Bk. 4, c. 19 (196: 160-1); etc.

48. "maximae tubae duorum Testamentorum: hic Joannes praecipuus evangelistarum, et ille alius Joannes maximus prophetarum," *In Jo.* (PL 169: 225 BC).

49. Smalley, *Speculum* 6 (1931), 75; Hervaeus, *In Is.*, Bk. 1 (PL 181: 91 CD).

50. Exodus 15:23-5.

51. "legis amaritudo vincatur amaritudine crucis," Bruno of Segni, *In Ex.* (PL 164: 267 B); Abelard, *Inv. of the cross, Praises:* "the wood sweetens the bitter waters when it is cast into them" (178: 1797); Adam of Saint Victor? (Gautier, 227).

52. *De bapt.*, c. 9, n. 2 (*SC*, 35, 78).

53. *In Ex.*, h. 7, n. 1: "If anyone wishes to drink from the letter of the law without the wood of life, that is to say, without the mystery of the cross, without faith in Christ, without spiritual understanding, he will die, because it is overly bitter. . . . The waters of Marah kill if they are drunk unchanged" (206); n. 2 (207); *In Jer.*, h. 8 (PL 25: 643-4).

54. Hilary, *Tr. myst.*, Bk. 1, c. 33-5 (Brisson, *SC*, 19, 128-32); Ambrose, *De nupt.*, c. 3, n. 14 (*SC*, 25, 112); Pseudo-Ambrose, *s.* 19, n. 5: "The letter of the law is bitter without

the mystery of the cross . . . concerning which the apostle says: the letter kills" (PL 17: 641 D); Augustine, *Q. in Hept.* (34: 615-6); Jerome (25: 468 C, 817 B); Quodvultdeus, *De prom.*, P. 1, c. 38, n. 55 (51: 765 B); Maximus of Turin, h. 39 (57: 312-4); Gr. of Elvira, *Tr.* 15 (164); Isidore (83: 297 A); Berengaud, *In Ap.*, v. 3: "but for people who come to believe in Christ the bitterness of the law is turned into sweetness through the passion and resurrection of Christ, since it has come to be understood spiritually by them, not carnally" (17: 827 CD); Pseudo-Hildebrand (96: 173). Rabanus, *In Ex.*, Bk. 2, c. 5-6 (108: 76-7); *In Num.*, Bk. 4, c. 8 (108: 813 D); Odo of Cluny, *Occupatio*, Bk. 6, v. 167 (Swoboda, 124); Rupert, *In Ex.* (167: 655 B); etc. Cf. Petrus Cellensis, *s.* 58 (202: 814 BC); Adam of Saint Victor (Gautier, 253); etc.

55. 2 Kings 2:19-22. Jerome, *In Os.*, prol. (PL 25: 817 B).

56. Jerome, *Ep.* 120, c. 1 (6, 122); Braulio, *Ep.* 44 (Madoz, 203); Rabanus, *De univ.*, Bk. 11, c. 6 (PL 111: 314-5); John Scotus, *h. in prol. Jo.* (122: 291 D); Aimo, *In ps. 41* (116: 341 A); Bruno of Segni, *In ps. 35* (164: 818 C); *in ps. 41* (845-6); Letbert of St. Ruf., *In ps. 41* (21: 809 A); Gerhoh, *In ps. 41:* "and deep calls to deep when the Law harmonizes with the Gospel" (193: 1514 BC); Peter Lombard, *In ps. 41* (191: 419 D); Cistercian catalogue (Wilmart, *Mém. Lagrange*, 315); etc.

57. "O quam hic abyssus Veteris Testamenti abyssum invocat Novi! O quam antiquiora recentioribus concinunt!" Rathier of Verona, *s.* 10, n. 3 (PL 136: 746 C); Gilbert, *In Cant.*, *s.* 18, n. 4 (184: 94 A). See the poem by an anonymous author (ca. 1198):

> ". . . and while a witness to the thing exists, deep
> Calls to deep. Both of the laws bear the name of 'deep.'"

(Leyser [1721], 749; Glunz [1937], 185).

58. Maximus of Turin, *s.* 65 (PL 57: 664 AB); Honorius, *In ps.* (194: 581 B).

59. Jerome, *In ps. 95* (*An. mar.*, 3, P. 2, 134-5).

60. Victorius of Pettau, *In Ap.* (Haussl., 24); Ambrose, *In ps. 61*, n. 33 (PL 14: 1180); Caesarius of Arles, *Exp. in Ap.* (Morin, 2, 212); Apringius, *In Ap.*, c. 4 (Vega, 25); Isidore, *L. de variis q.*, c. 1 (V.A. 7).

61. Honorius, *In ps. 103*, 2 (PL 194: 622 A); Augustine, *In ps. 103*, *s.* 1, n. 7-8 (*CCL*, 40: 1479); Cistercian Collection (Wilmart, 317).

62. "sacramenta Ecclesiae nondum manifestata fuerunt, spirituales intelligentiae Scripturarum nondum emanaverunt," Absalon, *s.* 35 (PL 211: 205 A). Cf. Gregory, *Mor.*, Bk. 17, c. 26, n. 38: "What does opening up the cistern mean other than penetrating the secrets of Holy Scripture with a powerful understanding?" (76: 28 AC); Bruno of Segni, *In ps. 73:* "You have cleft open springs and brooks. Springs and brooks are understood to be the books of the law and the prophets and both Testaments. These springs were closed and stopped up. But the Lord opened up their water courses, and broke open the tight-fitting fetters that bound them, and bade an abundance of waters to flow from them" (164: 982 A).

63. "a duritia litterae Vetus Testamentum inclinat, et ad intellectum spiritalem flectit," Gregory, *Mor.*, Bk. 19, c. 30, n. 55 (PL 76: 134 AB). As early as Augustine, *In ps. 7*, n. 14 (*CCL*, 38, 45). Rabanus, *In Reg.*, Bk. 4, c. 13: "The bow is sometimes wont to be construed as sacred eloquence, inasmuch as it consists of both Testaments, as if they were a bow and string. The bow symbolizes the Old Testament on account of its hardness. The string symbolizes the New Testament, which took its rise from the incarnate Lord. And while the string is drawn, the bow is bent, because when the New

Testament is discussed, the Old Testament is bent away from its literal hardness and is turned to a spiritual understanding" (109: 244 AB); Aimon, *In ps. 7* (116: 219 A); Remi, *In Hab.* (117: 192 B); Manegold, *In ps. 7* (93: 521 B); Letbert, *In ps. 7* (21: 673 C); Gerhoh, *In ps. 7* (193: 735 B); "stretching the bow and making it ready, tempering the strength of Holy Scripture with gentleness" (736 D); Peter Lombard, *In ps. 7* (191: 117 C); *Glossa in IV Reg.* 13-14 (according to Rabanus; 113: 619 D; cf. 855 A); Serlon of Savigny (Wilmart, *R. Mab.*, 11, 37); Innocent III, *s.* 13: "The hard wood is the Mosaic law, about which Peter the Apostle said: 'Why do you make trial of God by putting a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear?' (Acts 15). The soft and yielding string is the law of the Gospel, about which the Lord says: 'My yoke is easy and my burden is light . . .'" (PL 217: 516 BD).

64. "Utraque lex, arcus: cornu vetus et nova chorda;
Chorda rigens cornu flectit, veterisque rigorem
Legis. Ab historia nova flectit ad allegoriam."

Pseudo-Hildebert, *Locorum Scripturae moralis applicatio*, 36 (PL 171: 1269 C).

65. Prudentius of Troyes, *Tr. sup. aedif. Prudentii* (Pitra, 3, 424).

66. Victorinus of Pettau, *In Ap.* (24); Jerome, *In ps. 148* (*An. mar.*, 3, 2, 314); Augustine, *In ps. 149*, n. 12 (*CCL*, 40, 2185-6); Caesarius of Arles, *In Ap.* (*Op.*, 2, 212).

67. Honorius, *Spec. Eccl.* (PL 172: 893 D); Justus of Urgel, *In Cant.* (67: 977 C); etc.

68. Abelard, *s.* 28 (PL 178: 553 AB).

69. Bruno of Segni, *Tr. de sacram. Eccl.* (PL 165: 1095 A).

70. *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, h. 7 (PL 76: 844-8); Rabanus, *In Ez.*, Bk. 2: "The wheel within a wheel or the relationship of the two Testaments is indicated by Jacob's ladder and Isaiah's pincers and the double-edged sword" (110: 526 D; cf. 528-9); Radbert, *In Matt.*, Bk. 11, c. 24 (120: 830-1); Odo of Cluny, *Occupatio*, Bk. 6, v. 671-2 (138); Rupert (167: 1433 C); Honorius, *In Cant.*, Bk. 1 (172: 359 C); Hervaeus (181: 83 A); Aelred, *s.* 3, *in app. Dom.*: "We can clearly see the Gospel in prophecy and prophecy in the Gospel, like a wheel within a wheel" (193: 230 BC); Phil. of Harvengt, *De somnio Nabuch.* (203: 590 C); Radbert *(loc. cit.)* compares the symbol of the millstone.

71. "Et vetus et nova lex intelligitur rota duplex:
Exterior velat, velata secunda revelat."

twelth century? (Neuss, 1912, 236).

72. Origen, *In Gen.*, h. 7, n. 5 (75-6); Claudius, *In Gen.*, Bk. 2, on Genesis 20: 62 (PL 50: 977-8); Remigius, *In Gen.* (131: 99 A, 106 C, 163 A); etc.

73. Letbert, *In ps. 67*, n. 14 (PL 21: 914-5); Alan of Lille, *Dist.* (210: 743 D); etc.

74. "Recognovit Isaac stolam Scripturae veteris, et ideo cognovit esse mutatam," Ambrose, *De Jacob et vita*, b., Bk. 2, c. 2, n. 9 (PL 14: 618 B).

75. Isidore, *L. de var. q.*, c. 1 (5-6).

76. "ut in historia spiritus habeas intelligentiam, et in tropologia historiae veritatem," Rupert, *In Ez.*, Bk. 2, c. 28 (PL 167: 1489 BC).

77. "geminata figura," Aponius, *In Cant.*, Bk. 5 (102).

78. Augustine, *In ps. 150;* n. 1 (*CCL*, 11, 2191); Gerhoh, *In ps. 150* (PL 194: 995 D).

79. Aponius, *In Cant.*, Bk. 9 (174).

80. Bruno of Segni, *De sacr. Eccl.* (PL 165: 1094 D); Sicard, *Mitrale*, Bk. 1, c. 6 (213: 30 C). Cf. Honorius regarding the bell rope, *Gemma animae*, Bk. 1, c. 143: "The rope descends from the wood, and Sacred Scripture descends from the wood of the cross

and the Lord's passion" (173: 589 A); *Sacramentarium*, c. 30: "This rope takes its rise from wood, because it signifies the Sacred Scripture of the New Testament descending from the wood of the Lord's cross" (763 BC). Cf. John of Avranches, *L. de off. ecc.* (R. Delamare, 12).

81. "sacrorum Testamentorum pulcherrima duo volumina collocantur," "ad unum respiciunt, unum sapiunt," *De anima*, c. 9 (PL 70: 1295 B).

82. ". . . Quaque autem se Arcturus vertit, Pleiades, quae Testamentum novum significant, ostendit; quia per omne quod Testamentum vetus loquitur, Testamenti novi opera nuntiantur." *Mor.*, Bk. 29, c. 31, n. 73 (PL 76: 518 BD); Garnier, Bk. 1, c. 10 (PL 193: 48 C).

83. Gilbert of Stanford, *In Cant.*: "What then are the lips of the bridegroom other than the two Testaments, through which the mysteries of the heaven's secrets are opened up to mortal men?" (Leclercq, *St. ans.*, 20, 227).

84. Rupert, *De div. off.*, Bk. 9, c. 6: "So that this may be proved more clearly, you may draw on an authentic likeness from the older historical account" (PL 170: 250 C).

85. Cf. J. D. Michaelis, *Entwurf der typischen Theologie* (1763); G. Rau, *Untersuchung über die Typologie* (1784); Chr. Blasche, *Neue Aufklärung des mosaischen Typologie* (1799). Cited by Patrizi, *Inst. de interpr. Bibliorum* (2d ed., 1876), p. 174; cf. p. 165. In 1875 the author of a treatise entitled *De sensu spiritali* took his cue from Perrone and remarked that: "This whole discipline bears the name 'typology,' which was given to it by recent writers" (Corn. à Lapide, *Opera*, 20, 2).

86. Thus K. J. Woollcombe, *Essays on Typology* (1956), 39: "Typology considered as a method of exegesis, may be defined as the establishment of historical connections between certain events, persons or things in the Old Testament and similar events, persons or things in the New Testament."

87. Cf. Alberto Vaccari, *Scritti di Erudizione e di Filologia* 2 (1958), 352: "historical reality represents historical reality, which is the essence precisely of typology"; "typology is always maintained on the level of history and material reality."

88. Cf. Origen, *In Rom.*: "Our understanding is renewed by our recourse to wisdom, by meditating on the word of God, and by a spiritual understanding of his law. To the extent that a person profits from his daily reading of Scripture and gains a deeper understanding of it, he becomes a new person and is daily made over into a new person" (PG 14: 1206 C); taken up by Sedulius Scotus, *In Rom.*, c. 12 (PL 103: 110 B); *In Lev.*, h. 1, n. 1 (281); Ambrose, *In Luc.*, Bk. 9, n. 18: "By the two Testaments our wounds are cured" (*SC*, 52, 146).

89. Bernard, *In vig. nat. Dom.*, *s.* 6, n. 6 (PL 183: 112 A); etc.

90. Sedulius Scotus, *In Rom.*: "so that we might serve the law of God in spiritual newness, that is to say, so that we might, by the prompting of the Holy Spirit, comprehend the spiritual sense in everything that is written in it" (PL 103: 66 B). Rupert: "they follow the life-giving Spirit of the Scriptures" (168: 528 B). Bernard, *In Epiph.*, *s.* 2, n. 2 (182: 148 B); *De div.*, *s.* 50, n. 2 (672 D). Cf. M. A. Dimier, "Pour la fiche Spiritus libertatis," *RMAL*, 3, 56-60.

91. Paul uses "typological antithesis": L. Cerfaux, *Le Christ dans le théologie de S. Paul*, 176 and 186. Cf. *Histoire et Esprit*, 384-395. An example is to be found in the canticle of Anne, the mother of Mary, and the canticle of Mary, the mother of Jesus: Bouyer, *Le trône de la Sagesse*, 54.

92. Gregory Naz., *Disc.* 38 (December 25, 379), c. 2 (PG 26: 313 A). Cf. Origen, *In Lev.*, h. 10, n. 3 (445). G. Durand, *Rationale,* Bk. 6, c. 1 (Lyon, 1551, f. 154 r.).

93. Origen, *In Gen.*, h. 6, n. 3: "The letter of the law must die first, so that the soul, when it is freed, may be wedded to the Spirit and achieve the wedded bliss of the New Testament. The present time represents a time in which the gentiles are being called and the law is dead. In this way, their souls, unhampered and freed from the bondage of the law, may be wedded to the one man who is Christ" (68-9).

94. "dies nostrae novitatis," *Sermo Galterii in Pascha* (Delhaye, *RTAM,* 21, 207).

95. Rupert, *In Ap.*, Bk. 9, c. 14 (PL 169: 1092 C).

96. Petrus Cellensis, *s.* 34 (PL 202: 739 D); cf. *s.* 20 (699-700).

97. Cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, Bk. 3, c. 10, n. 2, regarding the "Benedictus" (PG 7: 874 A).

98. Didymus, *De Sp. sancto,* c. 33 (PG 39: 1063 C).

99. Romans 7:6. Irenaeus, *Dem.*, c. 90 (Froidevaux, *SC,* 62, 157).

100. Odo, *Epit. Mor.*, Bk. 30: "When it became known that having been made man he possessed the combined operations of the Holy Spirit, he put the finishing touches on the work of the Old Testament, so that, with the freedom of the Holy Spirit, each person might understand what he earlier served in fear amid a host of dangers" (PL 133: 450 A).

101. Aimo, *In Zach.* (PL 117: 233 D).

102. "Non mediocris est Deus, nec angustus!" Novatian, *De Trin.*, c. 6 (PL 3: 896 A).

103. "intelligentia spiritualis"

104. "libertas christiana"

105. *Doct. chr.*, Bk. 3, c. 5-8, n. 9-12 (Combès-Farges, 351-7).

106. *C. Adim. man.*, c. 15, n. 3: "Thus Divine Scripture should be read and the dispensation of the Holy Spirit should be recognized. Prophecy should be thoughtfully considered and fleshly servitude should be rejected, while the understanding that liberates should be retained" (PL 42: 155); Hervaeus, *In Gal.:* "the preaching or grace of the New Testament, which begets a people who are free" (181: 1173 C). Cf. Bede: "proceeding out of that which is narrowly literal" (92: 270 D, 594 D); "by transcending the covering veil of the letter through the life-giving Spirit, he prepares a dwelling for Christ in the mind's lofty lodging." Rupert, *In Ex.*, Bk. 1, c. 2 (167: 569 A).

107. "Egredimini de sensu carnis ad intellectum mentis, de servitude carnali ad libertatem spiritualis intelligentiae," *In Epiph.*, *s.* 2, n. 2 (PL 183: 148 B). Cf. *L. carolini,* Bk. 1, c. 19 (98: 1048 AB).

108. *S.* 42 (PL 194: 1830 C).

109. 2 Corinthians 3:16-7; cf. Exodus 34:34. Rabanus, *In Ez.*, Bk. 6, c. 10 (PL 110: 640 A).

110. "Legant ergo et intelligant ministri Novi Testamenti sacras Scripturas non ex sensu quem faciunt, sed ex sensu ex quo fiunt" (PL 155: 2035).

111. ". . . ac toto surgit gens aurea mundo." It is Quodvultdeus who adds this citation from Virgil (*Eclogues* 4:9) to those of St. Paul: *De prom.*, P. 3, c. 33, n. 34 (PL 51: 831 B).

Notes to Chapter Five
§5. The Sense Given by the Spirit

1. Pseudo-Remigius, *In ps.:* "the spiritual understanding is not given to just anyone who happens to be doing research. . . . I welcomed the Holy Spirit and he gave me understanding" (PL 131: 757 D); Rupert, *In Nahum,* Bk. 2: "And because the words belong to the Holy Spirit, let us inquire, rather, into the spiritual mysteries in the words" (168: 555 B); Bernard, *In Cant., s.* 51, n. 2: "Now let us follow the lead of the Spirit of truth and try to get at the spiritual fruit that is in those words" (183: 1025 BC).

2. Jerome, *In Gal.:* "It is our contention that the person who acknowledges all the sacramental mysteries of Scripture and understands them in a lofty way is . . . truly spiritual. The truly spiritual person, moreover, sees Christ in the divine books and does not allow them to be construed in the light of Jewish tradition" (PL 26: 390).

3. "spiritualis vitae intelligentiam," Othloh, *Dial. de trib.,* c. 33: "The whole history of the Old Testament concerns these events. All these events, although they have a literal, earthly dimension, are sketched out in such a way as to teach the necessity of seeking an understanding of the spiritual life through them" (PL 146: 102 A).

4. "spiritualia de Christo arcana," Autpert, *In Ap.,* Bk. 4 (484 G).

5. "Lex in Christo spiritaliter debet intelligi," Alcuin, *In ps.* (PL 100: 597 A); Hilary, *Instr. ps.,* n. 21: "It should be understood that by the teaching of the Holy Spirit they have been led to a spiritual notion of all knowledge, so that each one of them practices his system of spiritual understanding in accordance with the soundness of his faith" (17).

6. Cf. Gilbert Foliot, *Fifth unpublished homily:* "let us now approach the contemplation of the light of those lamps in the spirit of the Lord"; cited by Ch. Dumont, *COCR* [1957], 218.

7. "Spiritaliter intelligere debemus. Post historiae veritatem, spiritualiter accipienda sunt omnia." Jerome, *In Is. prol.* (PL 24: 20 B).

8. Including Leo XIII's encyclical *Providentissimus:* "The Church has received this mode of interpretation from the Apostles and has approved it with her example, inasmuch as it stands out in the liturgy." And repeatedly in Pius XII's encyclical, *Divino afflante.*

9. "maxime omnium communis ac trita"

10. As in *De sensu spiritali,* in Cornelius a Lapide, *Opera,* 21 (1875), 1 and 13. Cf. J. Ev. Gartnerus, *De arcano S. Scripturarum sensu,* ass. 7, n. 21 (s.d., 17th century); etc. Cf. Th. de Régnon, *Et . . . sur la Trinité,* 3, 1 (1898), 146.

11. Taken from Charles Baudouin, *Psychanalyse du symbole religieux* (1957), 12-13.

12. "tamen spiritaliter in Christo et Apostolis verius pleniusque complentur," Jerome, *In Jer.,* Bk. 6, c. 32 (PL 24: 900 A).

13. "ea quae sunt plenitudinis sentienda." Cf. Origen, *In Jer.,* h. 21, n. 2: "The words of fullness come alive in the Holy Scriptures even today. They come alive for those who have eyes to see heavenly things and ears to hear divine things, and a nose for the fullness that can be sensed in it" (PG 13: 536 C).

14. Lanfranc, citing Jerome, *In Col.,* 2, 26 (PL 24: 20 B); etc.; Origen, *In Jo.,* Bk. 6, 3, 15: "the fullness of Christ" (Preuschen, 109).

15. *In 1 Reg.,* Bk. 4, c. 4, n. 49 (PL 79: 267-8).

16. "sensus plenus," "in order to extract the full sense from the sacred books" (*Ench. bibl.*, 498).

17. Especially so, in terms of this whole issue, after Father Pesch (1906), and, from the point of view of the terminology, after Father Fernandez (1925). Cf. G. Courtade, "Les Ecritures ont-elles un sens 'plenier'"? *RSR* 37 (1950), 481-99. The author refuses, quite justly, I believe, to acknowledge the existence of a "fuller" sense which is not the spiritual sense.

18. J. Coppens, *ETL* (1958), 17. Cf. R. Aubert, *La théologie catholique au milieu du XXe siècle*, 26; J. Renié, *Manuel d'Ecr. sainte*, 1, 189; etc. And the judicious remarks of Karl Rahner, S.J., *Ecrits théol.*, 1 (French translation, 1959), 26-28.

19. P. Grelot, in *Intr. à la Bible*, 1 (1957), 180. Lagrange, *R. bibl.*, 9, 141.

20. Let Marian theology stand as an example. Father L. Bouyer says that it is "at once an exigency and a product of the whole Word of God. For the texts where Mary appears by name are a knotted tangle, as it were, of several great biblical themes. These themes, far from appearing in only one or two secondary sections of Revelation, encompass its major ideas. In turn, *once they found the seat of their development in the Virgin of the Gospels*, they underwent an expansion around her. The great Marian tradition is merely this process of expansion. In it we discover how the Church, in reading the Marian texts of the New Testament, recognized what there was in the Old Testament that was oriented to Mary . . ." (*Le trône de la sagesse*, 13-4; the emphasis is mine). And 53: "The Old Testament provides the lines of thought according to which the New Testament itself should be understood. Nevertheless, it provides only a sketch of these lines of thought, which cannot be joined together and fashioned into a complete whole before the coming of Christ. Accordingly Christ does limit himself to a more vigorous clarification of what was given in the Old Covenant. What is produced is a transposition of previous themes that would be impossible without the new fact, the new givens of the Gospel. . . ."

21. L. Lallemant, *Doctrine spir., Du don d'intelligence:* "It is particularly necessary in order to come to a proper understanding of Holy Scripture" (Pottier, 1924, 221); Origen, *In Matt.*, ser. 40 (78); *In Ex.*, h. 4, n. 5 (176); *In 1 Cor.*, 11 (*JST*, 9, 240); *Philok.*: "Pushing ahead with research" is necessary, but so is "prayer" (Robinson, 67); *In Rom.* (PG 14: 919 B).

22. "Quisquis enim mysteria Scripturarum sine Dei Spiritu reserare posse se aestimat, plane veluti sine luminibus alienos parietes erroneus palpat." Guibert de Nogent, *Trop. in Os.*, 12, 4 (PL 156: 402 C); Jerome, *In Mich.*, Bk. 1, c. 10, n. 15 and *In Gal.*, 5, 19; cited by Benedict XV, in his encyclical, *Sp. Paraclitus*.

23. Paschasius, *In Lam.*, Bk. 2: "and knowledge of the Scriptures is that life by which Christ is recognized and which is prepared as something eternal for believers" (PL 120: 1105 A).

24. Caesarius of Arles, *In Ap.*, h. 19 (PL 35: 2452); Gregory, *Mor.*, Bk. 20, c. 8-9, n. 18-20 (86: 147-9); Peter Comestor, s. 3: "For unless your humility is greater than the humility of the philosophers, you will not enter the kingdom of heaven, that is to say, you will not touch on the hidden mystery of Sacred Scripture" (198: 1731 A); etc. Cf. Origen, *In Ier.*, fr. 1 (195); Augustine, *Confessions*, Bk. 3, c. 5, n. 9 (1, 51).

25. Lallemant, *Doct. sp.*, 221: "Holy Scripture is difficult to understand, because in it God speaks according to his perceptions, which are infinitely far removed from ours. But he tempers them in such a way that we can understand them by our purity of

heart." Cassian, *Coll.* 14, c. 9: ". . . there is no way in which human doctrine or worldly learning will ever attain this. Only a mind that is pure will attain it through the illumination of the Holy Spirit" (*SC*, 54, 195).

26. Jerome, *In Is.*: "You who are complete and perfect, and have the light of a knowledge of the Scriptures within you" (PL 24: 266 B).

27. "Soli illi qui mente terrena desideria transcendunt, majestatem sanctae Scripturae, quae in Domino est adimpleta, perspiciunt." Bede, *In Marc.* 8 (PL 92: 218 B); "many of us read the words of Scripture indiscriminately; but a small number of those who are more perfect understand how its lofty heights shine forth in splendor through the mysteries of Christ."

28. Aimo, *In 2 Cor.*, 3: "The Spirit is life-giving, that is to say, the spiritual understanding is a bearer of eternal life" (PL 117: 618 AB).

29. "Regnum caelorum, notitia Scripturarum," *In Matt.* (PL 26: 90 A); Bede (92, 62 D); Peter Comestor; etc.

30. For example, L. Bouyer, *La Bible et l'Evangile* (1951), notably c. 12 and app. 1; C. Charlier, *La lecture chrét. de la Bible* (1950); Jean Levie, *La Bible, parole humaine et message de Dieu* (1958). There are also some observations in the conclusion of Henri de Lubac's *Histoire et Esprit*.

31. Cassian, *Coll.* 14, c. 10 (SC, 54, 195); etc.

32. Rupert, *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, c. 18: "Open your mouth and I will fill it. To eat is to understand Scripture, which is a gift from God. On this account he says: eat whatever I give you. Therefore it is our duty to open our mouth, which is to say, to seek an understanding of Scripture. We must fill it with God, which is to say, we must open up the true sense of Scripture" (PL 167: 1440 D); Augustine, *Doct. chr.*, Bk. 3, c. 37, n. 56: "what is most especially necessary is that they they should pray to have understanding: for in that literature which they are keen on studying they can read that the Lord gives wisdom and that from his mouth come knowledge and understanding (Proverbs 2:6)" (Combès-Fargues, 422).

33. Rabanus, *In Mach.*, Bk. 2: "as for the five books of the law . . . when they have been reduced to a spiritual knowledge, and when, by spiritual knowledge, the literal veil of types has been lifted and they are invested with the sense that is inherent in the Gospel" (PL 109: 1243 A).

34. Cf. R. Guardini, *Liberté, grâce et destinée:* "As soon as the Old Testament is slighted and devalued, the effect is felt immediately in the New Testament, which assumes by degrees a philosophical and psychological character and loses its significance" (French translation by J. Ancelet-Hustache [1957], 235, n.).

35. "Si vis intelligere, non potes nisi per Evangelium," Origen, *In Ex.*, h. 7, n. 7 (213). Cf. Leclercq, *L'amour des lettres*, 82 (the example of Baldwin of Ford) and 104.

36. "Sancta Scriptura, quae spiritalibus loquitur regni Dei mysteria, saecularibus hominibus est quasi parabola"; God. of Admont, *h. dom.* 23 (PL 174: 154 D).

37. "In curri eunuchi reginae Ethiopum clausis oculis Scripturas loquuntur, et lectitant, et eum qui 'sicut ovis ad occisionem ductus est' (Isaiah 53) . . . respicere dedignantur aut nequeunt. . . . Utique, licet Scripturarum insideant rotis, et pennatorum animalium impetu perferantur, lingua eorum, cum de superioribus disputaverit, terram lingit, nec Scripturas intelligunt, quia cor eorum non aperit scientarum Dominus. . . ." *Polycr.*, Bk. 8, c. 17 (PL 199: 784 AB). Cf. *Ep.* 284 (in 1168): What was once said to the

Ethiopian eunuch could be said to many professors: "Do you think you understand what you are reading?" (319 D).

38. Chrysostom, *In Gen.*, h. 21, n. 1 (PG 53: 175).

39. "proprio sudore et ingenii subtilis sibi innati exercitio," Jocelin of Furness, *Vita Walteni*, ASS, vol. 1 (cited by Amédée Hallier, *Aelred de Rievaulx* [1959]).

40. Cf. J. Guillet, "Deux aspects du sens spirituel de l'Ecriture," in *Anal. gregor.* 68 (1954), 303.

41. Othloh, *L. de cursu sp.*, c. 3 (PL 146: 146 C); Augustine, *In ps. 111*, n. 1: "it includes the grace of the spiritual understanding" (CCL, 11: 1625).

42. Richard, *In Cant.*, c. 15: "Thus the eyes of the devoted soul are the eyes of a dove, since its senses are illuminated and instructed by the Holy Spirit and have a taste for spiritual things, etc. Now a soul whose senses are opened up like this is enabled to understand the Scriptures" (PL 196: 450 B and D).

43. Jerome, *Ep.* 120, q. 10 (6, 149; regarding the Letter to the Romans); cf. *Ep.* 53, c. 5 (3, 14), etc.; Gregory, *In Ez.*, Bk. 1, h. 7, n. 17: "He both created and disclosed the words of the Holy Testaments" (76: 848 D).

44. "Spiritalis sensus, quem Spiritus dat Ecclesiae," Origen, *In Lev.*, h. 5, n. 5 (343).

45. "Unctione Spiritus revelante, ad intelligentiam Scripturarum animus dilatatur." H. de Marcy, *De per. civ. Dei, tr.* 16 (PL 204: 384 D).

46. Cf. Augustine, *In ps. 103, s.* 3, n. 5: "Spiritual men who make judgments about everyone and are judged by no one: therefore they are the only ones who have not fallen divisively into heresy and schism" (CCL, 40: 1503).

47. " 'Levavi oculos meos in montes. — Intelligimus montes, claros quoque et magnos Ecclesiae spiritales viros. . . . Per ipsos nobis Scriptura omnis dispensata est. Prophetae sunt, evangelistae sunt, doctores boni sunt: illuc levavi oculos meos in montes, unde veniet auxilium mihi." *In ps. 39*, n. 6 (CCL, 38: 429).

48. "studiose et pie," Augustine, *De ut. cred.*, c. 3, n. 9 (Pegon, 228).

49. Scheeben, *Dogmatique*, n. 237 (French trans. by Bélet, 1, 183); C. Passaglia, S.J., *De immac. conc.* (1854), 985: "There is not a Catholic who does not entirely prove the twofold sense of the Scriptures, the fact that it is mediated and not mediated, literal and spiritual, historical and mystical."

50. Father Spicq has good reason to protest a practice like this, "inasmuch as hermeneutically the 'spiritual sense' has a very precise meaning that denotes the reality suggested by the literal sense" (*RSPT*, 1948, 90-1).

51. René Marlé, S.J., "Bultmann et l'A.T.," *NRT* 78 (1956), 483.

Index of Names

Abelard, 28, 33, 43, 55, 59, 64, 69, 95, 113, 128, 167, 174, 179, 202
Absalon, 96, 113
Adam of Perseigne, 19, 23, 50, 102
Adam of Saint Victor, 170, 243
Adam Scotus, 22, 31, 53, 91, 100-101
Adelmann of Liège, 5
Ado of Vienne, 192
Aelbert, 37
Aelred of Rievaulx, 65, 78, 80, 92, 95, 113, 169
Aeneas of Paris, 63, 166
Agobard, 4
Aimeric of Angoulême, 4
Aimon of Auxerre, 45, 57, 84, 85, 88-89, 97, 166, 192, 193, 194, 197, 201, 211, 246
Alan of Lille, 7, 46, 102, 104
Alaric, 158
Alberic, 27
Alcuin, 24, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 40, 48, 54, 56, 63, 84, 85, 88, 109, 166, 201
Aldhelm of Canterbury, 173
Aldhelm of Sherborne, 38, 52, 97, 99
Alexander of Canterbury, 99
Alexander of Hales, 124, 131
Alexander III, 57
Alexander Neckam, 32, 71, 170, 175-76
Alvarus, Paul, 4, 166, 167, 217
Amadeus of Lausanne, 96
Amalarius, 97, 166
Amand, 95
Ambrose, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 18, 52, 69, 142, 154, 159, 167, 170, 174, 175, 178, 180, 185, 198, 236
Ambrose Autpert, 5, 53, 85, 88-89, 170, 246, 252
Anastasius I, 18
Anastasius Bibliothecarius, 173, 196, 197
Andrew, 166
Andrew Alciatus, 4
Angelome of Luxeuil, 41, 84, 88-89, 93, 98, 130, 166, 167
Anselm, 25, 56, 67, 90, 253
Anselm of Havelberg, 31
Anselm of Laon, 25, 68, 69, 113
Antin, Paul, 201
Apollinarius, 183, 189
Apollo, 45, 105
Aponius, 20, 52, 79, 134, 200
Apringius of Beja, 84
Apuleius, 56, 161
Aristotle, 73, 117, 177, 201
Arius, 57, 183, 186, 189
Arnold, 53
Arnold of Bonneval, 25, 179

Arnold of Saint Pierre le Vif, 165
Artz, B., 144
Athanasius, 5, 195
Atto, 166, 190
Augustine, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 15, 18, 20, 21, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 39, 52, 56, 57, 59, 67, 69, 70, 77, 80, 81, 86, 90, 92, 105, 123-32, 134, 135, 138, 154, 155, 156, 158, 159, 161, 165, 166, 167, 170, 171, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 201, 206, 210, 215, 216, 221, 231-32, 237, 245, 246, 248, 252, 260, 261, 267
Augustine of Dacia, 1, 8, 115
Aulus Gellius, 165
Aurelius, 4
Avitus, 18, 178

Bacon, Roger, 72, 73
Baldwin of Canterbury, 101, 166, 248
Baluze, Etienne, 188
Bardenhewer, O., 144
Baron, Roger, 17
Barth, Karl, 233
Basevorn, Robert de, 12
Basil, 32, 165
Baudry of Bourgueil, 218
Beatus, 53, 84, 92, 94, 96, 167, 246
Bede, 4, 5, 16, 20, 21, 38, 54, 56, 67, 79, 88, 90, 92-93, 94, 97, 99, 127, 166, 167, 171, 174, 176, 179, 190, 191, 192, 246, 250
Bellator, 162
Benedict, 51
Benedict of Aniane, 164, 174
Benedict Biscop, 38, 249
Benedict XV, 263
Benignus, 217
Berengar of Tours, 4
Berengaud, 94, 190, 200, 246, 248
Berenger, 63, 64, 174
Berger, Samuel, 1
Bernard, 5, 22, 28, 49, 53, 64, 77, 80, 112, 114, 141, 168-69, 170, 175, 204-5, 206, 245, 260
Bernard of Chartres, 24
Bernard Silvestris, 104
Bethune-Baker, J. F., 144
Bigg, C., 117, 118, 119, 122
Blesilla, 157
Bloch, Renée, 230-31
Boeren, P. C., 90
Boethius, 127
Bonaventure, 12-13, 27, 114, 208
Boniface, 38, 48, 97
Bossuet, 28
Braulio of Saragossa, 67
Briggs, C. A., 144
Brochet, 158
Brunet, A., 13
Bruno of Segni, 5, 22, 42, 68, 84, 85, 168, 171, 172, 190, 201, 218, 246
Bruyne, Edgar de, 144, 223

Cadoc, 38
Caesarius of Arles, 22, 162
Caird, Edward, 235
Candide of Fulda, 52
Caplan, H., 84, 144
Cassian, John, 5, 16, 18, 20, 90, 92, 134-37, 139, 141, 142, 152, 153, 156, 165, 167, 201
Cassiodorus, 4, 33, 44, 54, 77, 82, 128, 162, 163, 178, 180, 195, 196, 198-99, 200, 201, 203, 258
Caster, M., 121
Cave, William, 145
Ceillier, 110
Cerinthus, 193
Chadwick, Nora K., 188
Chalcidius, 104
Charlemagne, 36, 37, 163, 176
Châtillon, Jean, 112, 171
Chenu, M. D., 13, 67
Christian of Stavelot, 41, 97, 166
Chromatius, 157
Chrysostom, John, 4, 5, 141, 222, 224
Cicero, 7, 38, 54, 161, 208
Claude of Turin, 83
Claudel, 62
Claudius of Turin, 56, 97, 128, 129, 162, 163, 166, 167, 171, 174, 246
Clement of Alexandria, 41, 45, 117-22, 124, 127, 138, 148

Columban, 20, 32
Conrad of Hirschau, 98
Cresconius, 52
Cyprian, 5, 18, 53, 69, 166, 190

Daillé, Jean, 157
Damasus, 213
Daniélou, Jean, 144, 230
Davidson, 119
Davy, M. M., 144
Decius, 185, 186
Defensor, 166
Delhaye, Philippe, 33
Delporte, 11
Demetrius, 193
Demosthenes, 161
Den Boer, W., 119
Denys the Carthusian, 96
Didymus the Blind, 174, 183, 189
Dionysius, 102, 172-73
Dioscorus, 189
Dominic of the Trinity, 127, 131
Donatus, 158, 200
Donidius, 161
Dubarle, A. M., 11
Dudden, F. H., 84
Dugauquier, J. A., 210

Ebert, A., 110
Einhard, 36, 37
Ekkehard, 192
Ekkehard IV, 249
Eleuchadius, 218
Elias of Aquilein, 183
Elipandus, 167
Elizabeth of Schönau, 208-9
Ellies-Dupin, 155
Elmer of Canterbury, 20
Ennius, 199, 200
Ennodius, 38
Epiphanius, 183, 184, 185-86, 188, 189, 190, 194, 195, 197, 198, 199, 212
Erasmus, 4, 145
Erigena, John Scotus, 33, 40-41, 42, 76-78, 80, 94-95, 105, 168, 173, 174, 217
Ermenrich of Ellwangen, 34, 200
Eucher, 40-41, 68, 94, 134, 137-42, 152, 153
Euloguis of Cordoba, 39
Euphronius of Autun, 161
Eusebius, 15, 32, 155, 158, 165, 175, 186, 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 201
Eusebius of Vercelli, 154
Eustochium, 102, 157, 158
Eutyches, 183, 189
Eutychius, 209
Evagrius, 152, 183, 189

Fabian, 198
Fabiola, 168
Faustus of Riez, 162, 215
Fichtenau, H., 36
Flacius Illyricus, 96
Florus of Lyon, 53, 55, 63
Foliot, Gilbert, 6, 32, 101, 113
Fortunatus, 37
Fréculfe of Lisieux, 109, 174, 192-93
Fronto, 7
Fulco, 174

Gall, 21
Gamache, Philippe, 2
Garnier of Rochefort, 47, 70, 78, 83-84, 102, 114, 166, 219, 220, 221
Gaudentius of Brescia, 154, 248
Gautier of Saint Victor, 65, 181, 207
Gelasius, 183, 189, 197
Genebrard, 146
Gennadius, 156, 183, 189
Geoffrey of Auxerre, 166, 169, 175
Geoffrey Babion, 6, 179, 245
George Syncellus, 196, 197
Gerald of Wales, 175, 208
Gerbert, 37, 55
Gerhoh of Reichersberg, 65, 72, 113, 166, 168, 170
Gerland of Besançon, 6, 46
Gerson, 84
Gertrude, 170
Ghellinck, Joseph de, 10, 12, 110, 144, 188, 214
Gilbert de la Porrée, 64, 65

Gilbert of Hoyland, 79
Gilbert of Stanford, 75-76, 79
Gilbert the Universal, 67, 168
Giles of Paris, 3
Gilson, Etienne, 169
Giraldus de Barri, 167
Gislibert of Saint Amand, 95
Glassius, Salomon, 145
Godescalc, 29, 37, 166
Godfrey of Admont, 168, 170
Godfrey of Saint Victor, 2-3, 8, 55, 70, 71, 100, 105, 168
Goldhazen, H., 1
Goscelin, 6, 167
Gotschalk of Limbourg, 4
Gregory, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, 28, 29, 31, 48, 49, 52, 56, 59, 66, 70, 78, 79, 80, 86, 87, 102, 108, 130, 132-34, 136, 137, 142, 143, 153-54, 159, 162, 165, 166, 167, 170, 171, 173, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 184, 195, 200, 216, 244, 245-46, 263
Gregory of Elvira, 52, 156, 248
Gregory IX, 72, 73, 221
Gregory Nazianzen, 32, 203
Gregory of Nyssa, 141, 167
Gregory Thaumaturgus, 45, 215
Gregory of Tours, 38
Grelot, P., 11
Grimald, 200
Guerric of Igny, 20, 93, 101
Guiard of Laon, 102, 167
Guibert of Nogent, 12, 90, 99, 174
Guigues, 22
Gunzo of Navarre, 42
Guy of Bazoches, 71

Hadrian II, 22
Hagenbach, K. R., 117, 144
Halinard of Sombernon, 217
Harmut, 164
Hatto, 109
Hélin, Maurice, 110
Hélinand of Froidmont, 22
Heloise, 51, 59
Herbert of Bosham, 78, 166, 175, 177
Herbert de Losinga, 98
Hermaniuk, M., 144
Hermann Contractus of Reichenau, 192
Hermann, Joseph, 19
Herrad of Landsberg, 42, 249
Hervaeus of Bourg Dieu, 32, 99, 180, 246, 253
Hervaeus of Villefosse, 168
Hervet, 119
Heterius, 53, 84, 92, 94, 167
Hilary, 5, 6, 7, 48, 77, 154, 155, 162, 202, 244, 248
Hildebrand, 168
Hildegard, 19, 102, 104
Hildemar, 166, 190, 201
Hilduin, 173
Hincmar of Rheims, 29, 166
Honorius, 6, 25, 45, 56, 67, 79, 99, 104, 113, 128, 129, 192, 200
Hucbald of Saint-Amand, 55
Huet, P. D., 154
Hugh, 69, 113
Hugh of Fleury, 110, 196
Hugh of Fouilloy, 100
Hugh Metel, 6, 219
Hugh the Primate, 70
Hugh of Rouen, 113
Hugh of Saint Cher, 102
Hugh of Saint Victor, 11, 17, 24, 30, 32, 33, 46, 55, 70, 78, 91, 99-100, 105, 129, 166, 174, 190, 203
Huguccio, 6, 7
Humbert, 174

Idlephonsus of Toledo, 84
Innocent III, 6, 71, 91, 102
Irenaeus, 154, 236, 255
Irimbert of Admont, 29, 79, 100
Isaac of Etoile, 95
Isaac of Stella, 6, 79, 80-81, 151, 260
Isidore of Seville, 5, 15, 20, 31, 56, 68, 90, 92, 97, 106, 128, 129, 130, 136, 139, 163, 165, 167, 171, 173, 174, 178, 184, 203, 207, 216, 218, 219, 248
Ivo of Chartres, 254-55

Jacques de Vitry, 221

Jean Béleth, 103, 176, 190
Jerome, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 20, 28, 39, 44, 48, 52, 53, 54, 58, 59, 70, 90, 92, 94, 102, 138, 139, 141, 142, 147, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 161, 163, 165, 166, 167, 168, 170, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181-83, 184, 186, 187, 188, 190, 192, 198, 199, 201, 202, 206, 207, 208, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 216, 217, 218, 219, 224, 238, 252, 255, 266
Joachim of Flora, 82, 190
Joannes Monachus, 4
Johannes Moschus, 209
John III, 165
John Balbi, 1
John of the Cross, 79
John the Deacon, 162, 167, 196
John of Fécamp, 64, 129
John of Gorze, 4
John of Saint-Arnoul, 4
John of Saint Mary, 175, 209
John of Salisbury, 23, 46, 53, 55, 64, 101, 164, 175, 200, 247, 265-66
John of Spain, 166, 167, 217
Jonah of Orleans, 29, 166
Josephus, 148, 151
Julian the Apostate, 195
Julian of Eclanum, 156
Julian of Toledo, 28, 55, 56, 166, 173
Junilius the African, 127, 128
Justin, 242
Justinian, 183, 184, 195, 199, 210, 212

Lagrange, M.-J., 10
Laistner, M. L. W., 84, 110, 144
Lanfranc, 5, 55, 64
Langton, Stephen, 91, 102, 256
Lasíc, Denys, 144
Leclercq, Henri, 185
Leclercq, Jean, 36, 73, 169
Leidrad, 48
Leo, 5, 32, 57, 166
Letbert of Saint Ruf, 246
Liberatus of Carthage, 195, 210
Licinianus of Cartagena, 162, 179
Loewe, R., 97, 144
Lothaire of Segni, 102
Loyen, André, 144
Lucan, 38
Lucretius, 111
Luke of Mont Cornillon, 93, 102
Lupus of Ferrières, 22, 36, 37, 109
Luther, Martin, 2, 9

Macarius, 157
Macrobius, 7, 23, 104
Madoz, J., 188
Magnus, 213
Maieul of Cluny, 217
Malden, R. H., 117
Mâle, Emile, 115
Mandonnet, 10
Manegold of Lautenbach, 30, 64, 67, 95, 166, 191-92, 193-94
Manfred of Magdeburg, 53
Mani, 123, 183
Marbodius, 68
Marcellinus, 158
Marsili, Salvatore, 153
Martin I, 173, 183
Martin of Leon, 102
Massignon, Louis, 11
Master Simon, 167
Maximinus, 193
Maximus the Confessor, 141
Maximus of Turin, 53, 252
Mechtilde, 209
Melanchthon, 96
Melania, 158
Methodius of Olympus, 195, 212
Milo of Saint Amand, 39
Mohammed, 196
Mondésert, 119
Morin, G., 164
Mosheim, 9

Nesteros, 135, 136, 153
Nestorius, 183, 188, 189
Newman, J. H., 80
Nicephorus Callistus, 196, 197
Nicetas, 250
Nicetas Choniates, 197

Nicetas of Nicomedia, 31
Nicholas I, 183, 195
Nicholas of Clairvaux, 175
Nicholas of Lyra, 1, 8, 103
Nicholas of Verdun, 249
Notker the Stammerer, 5, 20, 28, 38, 133-34, 163, 170, 174

Oceanus, 182, 198
Ockham, 103
Odilo of Cluny, 110
Odo of Canterbury, 99
Odo of Orleans, 165
Odo of Ourscamp, 166
Odo of Tournai, 64
Odorannus, 98
Oger, 101
Orderic, 182-83
Origen, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 15, 23, 25-26, 34, 36, 38, 41, 45, 52, 53, 54, 56, 59, 77, 80, 90, 92, 94, 105, 122, 138, 142-59, 161-72, 173-84, 185-224, 225, 232, 233, 238, 244, 245, 246, 252, 255, 256, 261
Orpheus, 41, 111
Otfried of Weissenburg, 109
Othloh of Saint Emmeran, 23, 64, 104
Otto of Freising, 64, 194

Pachomius, 52
Pacificus, 190, 201
Palladius, 152
Pammachius, 182, 198, 213
Pamphilus, 161, 165
Paré, G., 13
Pascal, Blaise, 206
Paschasius Radbertus, 39, 98, 166, 168, 253
Paul the Deacon, 133-34, 163, 168, 176
Paula, 102, 157
Paulinus of Nola, 158, 250-51
Paulus Orosius, 178, 181
Pelagius, 201
Pelagius II, 181, 183, 184
Peregrinus, 188
Perrone, 11
Pesch, Christian, 10, 82
Peter of Blois, 96
Peter Cambius, 207
Peter Cantor, 46, 65, 70, 102, 166, 175, 210-11
Peter Chrysologus, 189
Peter Comestor, 70, 83, 101, 113, 166, 179, 210
Peter Damian, 18, 22, 45, 64, 84, 85, 98, 168, 170, 218, 221
Peter Lombard, 43, 65, 68, 78, 92, 95, 102, 166, 175, 179
Peter of London, 102
Peter of Poitiers, 11, 68, 101
Peter of Riga, 103
Peter the Venerable, 51, 54, 165, 219
Peterson, Erik, 118, 119
Petrarch, 35
Petrus Alphonsus, 20
Petrus Cellensis, 21, 24, 34, 53, 65, 67-68, 85, 102, 171, 175
Philip of Harvengt, 65, 81, 101, 129, 166, 170, 190, 207, 209
Philo, 45, 147-50, 151, 154
Photinus, 188
Pinianus, 159
Pitra, Dom, 119
Pius V, 176
Plato, 41, 51, 52, 56, 117, 161, 183, 193, 203, 214, 216
Pliny the Younger, 7
Plutarch, 56
Porphyrus, 195
Porphyry, Publius Optatian, 110
Possevin, Anthony, 8, 26
Potter, 119
Prat, Ferdinand, 10, 144, 154
Prevostin of Cremona, 102
Primasius, 85, 86-89, 130, 200, 246
Priscian, 38, 177, 190, 201
Priscillian, 139
Proba Falconia, 41
Prosper, 20
Prudentius, 37, 250
Prudentius of Troyes, 94, 217
Pseudo-Alcuin, 97
Pseudo-Anselm, 99
Pseudo-Bede, 91, 167

Pseudo-Dionysius, 77, 79
Pseudo-Eligius, 97
Pseudo-Gelasius, 190
Pseudo-Isidore, 189
Pseudo-Jerome, 165
Pseudo-Melito, 68, 141
Pseudo-Thomas, 84
Puech, Henri-Charles, 171
Pythagoras, 183, 193

Quintilian, 138
Quodvultdeus, 53, 156, 248

Rabanus Maurus, 4, 20, 35, 48, 52, 69, 90, 92, 94, 104, 106-10, 111-12, 127, 129, 130, 166, 167, 168, 172, 173, 174, 179, 201, 216, 220, 221, 246
Raby, F. J. E., 110
Ralph de Diceto, 192
Ramphilus, 195
Raoul of Ardent, 113
Raoul of Saint Germer, 99, 128, 168
Rathier of Verona, 113, 217
Reginald of Canterbury, 181
Regino of Prüm, 173, 192
Remi of Auxerre, 55, 95, 97, 167, 171, 179
Rémy de Gourmont, 110
Ribod, 39
Richard of Saint Victor, 33, 67, 70, 78, 83, 92, 112, 114, 166, 172, 219, 246, 266
Richer, 55
Robert of Courson, 49, 211
Robert Grosseteste, 167
Robert of Melun, 91
Robert Paululus, 103
Robert Poulain, 102
Robert Puyllen, 179
Robert of Sorbon, 73-74
Rochais, H. M., 166
Roger, Maurice, 33
Roland Bandinelli, 68
Rosenmuller, J. G., 9
Roswitha, 19
Rufinus, 32, 38, 54, 93-94, 143, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158-59, 161, 162, 163, 165, 166, 171, 172, 177, 180, 181, 184, 187, 188, 194, 195, 206, 207
Rullus of Basel, 9
Rupert of Deutz, 21, 25, 30, 43-44, 45, 46, 54, 64, 67, 68, 69, 80, 84, 86, 95, 112, 151, 168, 170, 171, 220, 222-24, 254, 256
Rusticus Helpidius Domnulus, 250

Sabatier, Auguste, 10
Sabellius, 183
Sallust, 7, 38
Salomon of Constance, 163
Sedulius Scotus, 97, 161, 166, 167
Seneca, 138
Serarius, Nicholas, 2
Serenus, 134, 136
Serlon of Savigny, 101
Sicard of Cremona, 104
Sidonius Apollinaris, 7, 45, 161, 215, 250
Sigebert of Gembloux, 4, 16, 83, 111, 166
Simon, Richard, 154
Simon of Tournai, 68
Simplicianus, 155
Sirach, 43
Sixtus of Siena, 3, 8, 96, 124, 145, 154
Smalley, Beryl, 49, 84, 229
Smaragdus, 4, 7, 166, 167, 201
Socrates, 194-95, 196, 203, 224
Sozomene, 194, 196
Spicq, C., 11, 13, 84, 90, 92, 94
Stählin, O., 119
Stephen of Rouen, 174
Stephen of Tournai, 71-72, 73, 102
Suger, 248-49
Sulpicius Severus, 180, 181, 189
Susanna, 191
Sylburg, 119

Tajón of Saragossa, 68
Taylor, H. O., 110
Terence, 38, 214
Tertullian, 20, 187, 188, 209, 256
Theodemir, 97

Theodore of Mopsuestia, 183, 189, 195, 210
Theodoret, 194-95, 196
Theodorus Lector, 195
Theodotus, 122
Theodulph, 37
Theophanes the Chronographer, 196
Theophilus, 183, 184, 186, 189, 190, 199, 203, 208, 212, 222, 224
Theotimus, 195
Thomas Aquinas, 2, 8, 9, 10, 12, 27, 40, 97, 124-25, 126, 127, 184, 221
Thomas of Perseigne, 21, 94, 175
Thomas of Vercelli, 102
Tillemont, 182, 185
Tolet, Cardinal, 9
Tostado, Alonso, 124
Trajan, 209
Tremblay, P., 13
Trochon, 206
Trypho the Jew, 242
Turre, J. M. de, 8
Tyconius, 15, 88, 200, 245

Ulrich of Strasbourg, 96, 125, 126, 208, 211
Ursacius, 158

Vaccari, Alberto, 90, 144, 153
Valerian of Cimelium, 18
Victor of Capua, 167
Victor of Marseilles, 153
Victorinus, Marius, 104, 207
Victorinus of Pettau, 154
Vigilius, 183, 184, 199, 210
Vincent of Beauvais, 111, 208, 211
Vincent of Lerins, 180, 187, 188, 192, 194, 197, 198, 208
Virgil, 38-39, 41, 111, 199, 200, 207, 214
Völker, W., 146

Walafrid Strabo, 36, 38, 97, 109, 167
Walpurgis, 200
Werner of Saint-Blaise, 6, 23, 102, 168, 179, 219
Werner of Strasbourg, 164
William of Auvergne, 16, 103, 129
William of Champeaux, 68, 69
William Firmat, 39, 98
William of Hirschau, 200
William of Malmesbury, 55, 109
William of Saint Thierry, 21, 64, 95, 167, 174, 222
Wolberon, 81, 113, 246
Wolfhard, 200
Wolfson, H. A., 117, 119, 120, 144, 148, 149
Wycliffe, 103

Zachary of Besançon, 67, 95, 166, 207
Zeno the Stoic, 193
Zeno of Verona, 154